

**California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative
North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group
REVISED AGENDA – MEETING #1
May 22-23, 2007
Sheraton Four Points
San Rafael, CA**

MEETING OBJECTIVES

1. Review project goals, NCCRSG charge, and work plan
2. Review and adopt NCCRSG ground rules
3. Review key findings of stakeholder assessment and implications for NCC process
4. Initiate review of draft regional profile
5. Outline preparations for second NCCRSG meeting

MEETING AGENDA

Day 1	
9:30 a.m.	<i>Arrival, refreshments and greetings</i>
10:00 a.m.	Welcome, agenda review, and brief introductions (Handout 1)
10:30 a.m.	Review project goals, roles and responsibilities—presentations and discussion (Attachments 1-6, Handouts 2-3) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Logistics (communications, travel reimbursement) • MLPA and MLPA Initiative • MLPA Initiative participants -- roles and responsibilities • NCCRSG charter – project goals and NCCRSG charge • Project deliverables and overview of work plan
12:00 p.m.	<i>Lunch (provided on site)</i>
1:00 p.m.	Public comment
1:30 p.m.	Review project goals, roles and responsibilities (cont.)
2:00 p.m.	Review and discuss findings of stakeholder assessment and implications for NCC study region (Handout 4)
2:30 p.m.	Review, discuss, and adopt ground rules (Attachment 7)
3:15 p.m.	<i>Break</i>
3:30 p.m.	Breakout group activity on stakeholder interests and areas of expertise (with reference maps). Guiding questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are your interests in and uses of the ocean in the study region? • What geographic areas of the study region are you most familiar with?
4:45 p.m.	Review context—presentations and discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of previous MLPA efforts and review of lessons learned (Attachment 8) • Summary of concurrent MPA processes
5:45 p.m.	<i>Adjourn</i>
6:30 p.m.	<i>NCCRSG dinner for primary and alternate members (offsite)</i>

Day 2	
8:30 a.m.	Review agenda for Day 2 and questions from Day 1
8:45 a.m.	[As needed] Review selected revisions to ground rules; adopt final ground rules
9:00 a.m.	Overview of the Draft Regional Profile for the North Central Coast (separate binder) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of various elements • Available data and additional data collection efforts • Feedback on regional profile requested by June 20, 2007
11:00 a.m.	<i>Break</i>
11:15 a.m.	Activity: Breakout group discussion and report back on aspirations and concerns Focal questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are your greatest concerns regarding the project? What potential opportunities and obstacles do you see? • What will you do to overcome obstacles and make the project a success? • What can the I-Team do to make the project a success?
12:30 p.m.	<i>Lunch (provided on site)</i>
1:15 p.m.	Begin NCCRSG review and discussion of regional goals and objectives (Handout 5)
2:15 p.m.	Review NCCRSG role in creating alternative MPA proposals—information required, look/feel of final work product, and role of MLPA North Central Coast Science Sub-Team (Attachments 9-10)
3:15 p.m.	Next steps and preparations for next NCCRSG meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe key outcomes memoranda • Review objectives for meeting #2
3:30 p.m.	<i>Adjourn</i>

ATTACHMENTS

1. California Marine Life Protection Act
2. MOU for the California MLPA Initiative
3. Overview of the Marine Life Protection Act Initiative
4. Charters for the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force, Master Plan Science Advisory Team, North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group, and Statewide Interests Group
5. Group rosters (MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force, North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group)
6. URLs for key documents available in the MLPA website
7. Draft ground rules for the MLPA North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group
8. Marine Protected Areas Past Processes Overview and Summary of the First Phase (2004-2006) MLPA Initiative Process
9. Definition of key working terms (Appendix J of the California Master Plan for MPAs, July 21, 2006 version)
10. Outline of information required for proposals for networks of MPAs (Appendix F of the California Master Plan for MPAs, July 21, 2006 version)

HANDOUTS

1. Contact information for North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group members and for MLPA staff and advisors
2. Summary of MLPA roles
3. Draft timeline for the MLPA North Central Coast Project
4. Stakeholder assessment memorandum
5. MLPA Central Coast Project Adopted Regional Goals and Objectives Package, as Amended by the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force, *November 30, 2005*
6. PowerPoint presentation regarding project goals, roles and responsibilities
7. PowerPoint presentation regarding previous MLPA efforts, lessons learned, and concurrent MPA processes
8. PowerPoint presentation regarding the draft regional profile for the north central coast study region
 - a. Regional profile: Part 1, Overview
 - b. Regional profile: Part 2, Commercial and recreational fisheries
 - c. Regional profile: Part 3, Existing MMAs, MPAs and other managed areas
 - d. Regional profile: Part 4, Subregional summaries and timeline
 - e. Regional profile: Data to support MPA planning
9. PowerPoint presentation regarding the planning process for developing alternative MPA proposals

Key Outcomes Memorandum

Date: June 4, 2007

To: Members, MLPA North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group

From: Scott McCreary and Eric Poncelet, CONCUR, Inc.

Re: Key Outcomes Memorandum – May 22-23, 2007 Meeting

cc: MLPA Initiative Staff and California Department of Fish and Game MLPA Staff

Executive Summary – Key Outcomes

On May 22-23, 2007, the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) Initiative North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (NCCRSG) participated in its kick-off meeting in San Rafael, CA. **Key outcomes** from the meeting are as follows:

- NCCRSG members unanimously adopted ground rules. Two ground rules were added in discussion: one on the participation of agency representatives, and one on developing appropriate response to public comments. This discussion was informed by a presentation by CONCUR on the results of the stakeholder assessment.
- I-Team staff provided an overview of the NCCRSG's roles, charge, and workplan. NCCRSG members expressed strong support for approaching the development of MPA proposals in a deliberate, step-wise fashion. NCCRSG members broadly agreed that the group should digest scientific and socioeconomic information on the north central coast study region and relevant MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT) size and spacing guidelines for developing marine protected areas (MPAs) before beginning to "draw lines on maps."
- Senior officials from the California Resources Agency and the California Fish and Game Commission offered encouragement to the NCCRSG and guidance to develop MPA proposals that are scientifically based and integrative of multiple stakeholder interests.
- I-Team staff introduced the draft *Regional Profile of the North Central Coast Study Region (Alder Creek/Point Arena to Pigeon Point, California)*. NCCRSG members offered some initial comments. Significant portions of the next two NCCRSG meetings will be devoted to continued "joint fact finding" to improve baseline information that will inform the NCCRSG's deliberations.
- I-Team staff provided guidance to the NCCRSG for developing regional goals and objectives for the north central coast study region. I-Team staff presented the regional goals and objectives adopted for the central coast study region as a strong starting point. NCCRSG members expressed support for a streamlined approach to goals and objectives development and agreed to tackle that task at the next meeting.
- NCCRSG members participated in two breakout session activities to become better acquainted with each other's interests, hopes, concerns, and knowledge of the region.
- NCCRSG members representing federal, state, and local agencies described their anticipated role and engagement in the north central coast process.

Key **next steps** are listed in section III below.

I. Meeting Objectives, Participants and Materials

On May 22-23, 2007, the MLPA North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (NCCRSG) participated in a meeting in San Rafael, CA. This Key Outcomes Memorandum summarizes the meeting's main results.

The primary objectives of the meeting were to:

- 1) Review project goals, NCCRSG charge, and work plan
- 2) Review and adopt NCCRSG ground rules
- 3) Review key findings of the stakeholder assessment and implications for the north central coast process
- 4) Initiate review of the draft regional profile; and
- 5) Outline preparations for the second NCCRSG meeting

Twenty-one NCCRSG primary members and ten alternate members participated in the meeting.

MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF) members Meg Caldwell and Don Benninghoven participated in the meeting. Assistant Secretary Brian Baird attended on behalf of the California Resources Agency, and President Richard Rogers attended on behalf of the California Fish and Game Commission.

MLPA Initiative and California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) staff—collectively known as the “I-Team”—staffed the meeting.

Meeting materials may be found on the MLPA website at:
http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mrd/mlpa/meeting_052207.html

II. Key Outcomes

A. Ground Rules Reviewed, Revised, and Adopted

NCCRSG members reviewed, discussed, revised, and adopted a set of ground rules to guide NCCRSG interaction and meetings. The adopted ground rules are attached as Attachment 1.

This discussion built on a presentation by CONCUR of the main findings and crosscutting themes from the stakeholder assessment.

NCCRSG members adopted the ground rules with the following four revisions:

- Added a new ground rule section on “Participation of Federal, State and Local Agencies.” The revised text reads: “Given the significant portion of the north central coast study region that is under the jurisdiction of federal, state, and local agencies, the active participation of these agencies is welcome and encouraged in the north central coast process.” This text addressed NCCRSG member concerns that agency members participate actively throughout the NCCRSG process. [Note: NCCRSG members were also concerned that agency representatives be clear and forthcoming about their role and participation in the NCCRSG process. Key outcomes from this discussion are presented below in Section II.F.]

- Added a new bullet to the section on “Public Comment.” The revised text reads: “The MLPA Initiative Team will respond as appropriate to questions and suggestions posed in public comment portions of NCCRSG meetings.” This text responded to NCCRSG recommendations that I-Team staff respond, where possible and appropriate, to public comments made. I-Team staff also encouraged the public to communicate their comments and questions through the NCCRSG members. [Note: for future meetings, I-Team staff will also make a staff person available to the public to address clarifying questions.]
- Defined “consensus” in the section on “Decision Rules” as “broad based agreement”.
- Replaced “packages” in the phrase “alternative MPA packages” with the term “proposals” (global change).

B. Project Background: Review of NCCRSG Roles, Charge, History, and Workplan

1. NCCRSG charge

I-Team staff presented an overview of the roles, responsibilities, and charge of the NCCRSG. This included an overview of the anticipated process for developing alternative MPA proposals. I-Team staff also reviewed the history of past efforts to implement the MLPA.

2. Workplan and schedule

I-Team members outlined the workplan and schedule by which the NCCRSG will accomplish its charge. The most up-to-date schedule of NCCRSG meetings, which also includes anticipated MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT) and BRTF meeting dates, is attached as Attachment 2. Key NCCRSG meeting dates include the following:

NCCRSG Meeting Dates	Key Objectives and Milestones
July 10-11, 2007	Joint fact finding and review/adoption of regional goals and objectives
August 22-23, 2007	Joint fact finding and training on tools
October 16-17, 2007	Presentation and discussion of MPA proposals (iteration 1)
December 11-12, 2007	Presentation and discussion of MPA proposals (iteration 2)
February 6-7, 2008	Presentation and discussion of MPA proposals (iteration 3)
May 14-15, 2008 (if needed)	Review and comment on BRTF preferred alternative

NCCRSG members reviewed the workplan and acknowledged the logical sequence of moving from project orientation to joint fact-finding and tools training, and then to the iterative development of MPA proposals, culminating in the presentation of alternative MPAs to the BRTF in March 2008.

NCCRSG members expressed strong support for the sequence of events and, in particular, for the group to first become familiar with the north central coast regional profile and the SAT’s guidance for MPA development before beginning to “draw lines on maps.”

3. Questions and clarifications

Throughout the meeting, NCCRSR members asked clarifying questions regarding the NCCRSR's role and charge. Key clarifications offered by the I-Team include the following:

- a. How will issues as water quality, socioeconomic impact, and fisheries regulations be addressed in the NCCRSR process?
 - Members of the I-Team noted that the NCCRSR is expected to take all of these issues, including applicable regulations, into consideration in its deliberations. Information on all three issues will be addressed in the regional profile. The NCCRSR will also have the opportunity to address these issues in developing regional goals and objectives as well as design and implementation considerations for the north central coast study region. Additionally, the NCCRSR may choose to make recommendations on these issues to decision-making bodies as it completes its deliberations. The I-Team clarified that the MLPA is focused on ecosystem management rather than management of individual species, and that the MLPA presumes that MPAs provide ecosystem benefits independent of fishing regulations.
- b. Will the SAT revisit the science guidelines established for the central coast study region?
 - I-Team staff clarified that the science guidelines in the *California MLPA Master Plan for Marine Protected Areas* will guide the north central coast process and that the SAT will not be asked to do a wholesale revision of the guidelines for the north central coast process. The SAT will be asked to comment primarily in two areas:
 - 1) What regional ecological or oceanographic differences exist between the central coast and north central coast study regions that might have implications for the science guidelines?
 - 2) What new science has become available that might require changes in the guidelines?
- c. What is the working definition of “network”?
 - I-Team staff noted that additional definition is provided in the master plan. The I-Team will make this available to NCCRSR members in advance of their next meeting.
- d. Can the NCCRSR work toward producing a consensus based MPA proposal given the NCCRSR's charge to present the BRTF with alternative MPA proposals?
 - I-Team staff clarified that the charge of the NCCRSR is to produce alternative MPA proposals for the BRTF. This does not preclude the NCCRSR from expressing a strong preference around one alternative.
- e. What assurances are there that the adaptive management component of the project will be funded?
 - I-Team staff clarified that such funding decisions are in the hands of the California legislature and governor. The MLPA also states that the act will be implemented to the extent that funding is available.
- f. Will it be possible to bring in other software and analytical tools to support the MPA development process in addition to the regional profile, data layers, and decision support tool currently under development by the I-Team? Among the key tools mentioned were MARXAN, a “consensus mapping” approach, and Oceana's analysis of key areas of biological significance.

- I-Team staff expressed willingness to explore some of these tools. I-Team staff reminded NCCRSG members that use of such tools would need to be balanced with the project's time constraints as well as other potential challenges inherent in introducing additional complex elements to the NCCRSG process; these include the functionality of the tools, the ease of providing NCCRSG members with an orientation, and the ability of the tools to reflect the critical decision rules that guide the MLPA process. I-Team staff reiterated their commitment to having the MPA development process be as transparent as possible.

C. Guidance from Senior Officials at the California Resources Agency and the California Fish and Game Commission

Brian Baird, assistant secretary for ocean and coastal policy at the California Resources Agency, made several comments on behalf of Resources Secretary Mike Chrisman. Assistant Secretary Baird underscored the national significance of the MLPA Initiative and the north central coast process. He thanked NCCRSG members for their commitment and emphasized the importance of developing MPA proposals that are both "fair" and "scientifically valid."

Richard Rogers, president of the California Fish and Game Commission, emphasized the NCCRSG's opportunity to help return the ocean to "a state of sustainable abundance" that benefits consumptive and non-consumptive users alike. President Rogers acknowledged the extraordinary effort being asked of NCCRSG members and noted that the commission looks forward to the results of another successful regional stakeholder group process.

D. Introduction to Draft Regional Profile for the North Central Coast Study Region

I-Team staff presented the draft *Regional Profile for the North Central Coast Study Region (Alder Creek/Point Arena to Pigeon Point, California)*.

1. Request for review, and review schedule

I-Team staff clarified that the regional profile is a "living document." Initial public comments have been requested by June 20, 2007. It is expected that the NCCRSG will continue to review and propose revisions to the regional profile in a "joint fact finding" capacity at its July 10-11 and August 22-23, 2007 meetings. The goal is to complete revisions to the document by the end of summer 2007, in advance of initial NCCRSG work to develop MPA proposals.

In advance of the July 10-11, 2007 NCCRSG meeting, I-Team staff requested that NCCRSG members review the draft regional profile with an eye toward providing the following types of information:

- What information needs to be added to the regional profile?
- What additional sources of information are available?
- Editorial comments

2. Initial NCCRSG comments on draft regional profile

NCCRSG members asked a number of clarifying questions and offered some initial comments on the draft regional profile. Key among these comments were the following:

- NCCRSG members identified several areas requiring additional data (e.g., oceanographic information, information on the MPAs adopted in the central coast study region).
- Several NCCRSG members requested that SAT review the draft regional profile. I-Team staff confirmed that this would take place.
- Several NCCRSG members noted that while it makes sense to organize the north central coast study region into “sub-regions” for display in the regional profile, these “sub-regions” should not be used in the evaluation of MPA proposals.
- Several NCCRSG members noted that the format and structure used to present information in the regional profile will influence how the data get interpreted. These members requested that the regional profile be reviewed with an eye toward ensuring that it is presenting data in a value-neutral way. This may be addressed by added appropriate caveats and clarifications to particular presentations of data.

E. Introduction to Regional Goals and Objectives

I-Team staff presented a summary of the regional goals and objectives adopted as part of the central coast project. I-Team staff reminded NCCRSG members that one task of the group is to recommend regional goals and objectives for the north central coast study region.

1. Guidance for developing north central coast regional goals and objectives

I-Team staff provided the following guidance to the NCCRSG to inform the development of regional goals and objectives for the north central coast study region:

- Use the adopted regional goals and objectives from the central coast study region as a strong starting point.
- Anticipate that the central coast regional goals and objectives will require some revision, and consider how to tailor them to the north central coast study region, with a particular focus on the unique ecology, socioeconomics, and geography of the study region.
- A key lesson learned from the central coast process was that while regional goals and objectives play an important role in adaptive management of MPAs, they were less central in informing the design of alternative MPA proposals. The design of MPA proposals is informed more by scientific guidelines (e.g., on MPA size and spacing) developed by the SAT. As such, development of regional goals and objectives is worth a moderate but not large time investment. I-Team staff advised that the appropriate time investment for developing regional goals was probably a portion of one meeting. NCCRSG members who had served on the MLPA Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group reflected that the NCCRSG would be wise to streamline the lengthy process used in the central coast.

2. Next steps

NCCRSG members will discuss north central coast regional goals and objectives at their July 10-11, 2007 meeting. NCCRSG members should prepare by reviewing the central coast regional goals and objectives with the above guidance in mind. The expectation is to discuss, revise, and adopt a set of regional goals and objectives for the north central coast at the July 10-11, 2007 meeting.

F. Role of Agency Participants

Representatives of several federal, state, and local agencies serve on the NCCRSG. Given the respective differences in agency mandate and organization, there will be some corresponding variation in the way these members choose to engage in the NCCRSG process.

Recognizing that variation, several stakeholder group members requested that NCCRSG agency representatives strive to be clear on the role they will play in the NCCRSG process. In particular, they requested that agency representatives clarify:

- whether they will be speaking from their agencies' formal perspectives or whether they might, in some instances, weigh in based their own expertise and professional experience;
- their views and positions on particular MPA proposals; and
- whether they intend to vote as a way of expressing preferences with regard to alternative MPA proposals.

All of the agency representatives acknowledged the importance of sharing information and their agencies' views throughout the process of developing alternative MPA proposals. I-Team staff confirmed that this was required by the adopted ground rules. One such rule requires NCCRSG members "to share, and not withhold, relevant information to inform the revision of the *Regional Profile of the North Central Coast Study Region (Alder Creek/Point Arena to Pigeon Point, California)* and the identification of candidate MPAs."

Some agency representatives also pointed out that their agencies may be required to comment on the outcomes of the NCCRSG's efforts as part of the rule-making process.

G. Breakout Sessions

NCCRSG members participated in two breakout sessions intended as both an "icebreaker" and as an information-gathering tool. The first focused on sharing interests and expertise in the north central coast study region. The second focused on sharing hopes and concerns for the north central coast process as well as possible ways to address these concerns.

NCCRSG members got to know each other better through these activities. Collectively, NCCRSG members bring a base of knowledge and experience that extends throughout the study region. There was also significant overlap in the interests, hopes, and concerns expressed by NCCRSG members.

A table summarizing NCCRSG member interests in and uses of the ocean in the study region, and the geographic areas they are most familiar with is attached as Attachment 3.

H. Project Logistics

1. Reimbursement Procedures

I-Team staff reminded NCCRSG members that they will be reimbursed for travel and lodging associated with NCCRSG meetings. NCCRSG members are to keep their receipts and submit the formal reimbursements forms directly to the Resources Legacy Fund Foundation.

2. Dissemination of meeting materials

I-Team staff noted that meeting materials are available in multiple formats, (i.e., hard copy, emailed electronic files, electronic files on CDs) and asked NCCRSG members to indicate which form they prefer.

All NCCRSG members (primaries and alternates) will be added to the NCCRSG listserv. This listserv will be the primary communications tool for the NCCRSG.

I. Public comment

Members of the public provided comment and asked clarifying questions during two separate public comment periods. Comments were focused on the topics of: NCCRSG representation and appointments, potential spillover effects of MPAs, responding to lessons learned from the central coast process, and building baseline information to support the north central coast process. Consistent with a newly adopted ground rule, the I-Team will respond to public comments as appropriate.

J. Objectives for NCCRSG Meeting #2

The next NCCRSG meeting is scheduled to take place on July 10-11, 2007 in the southern part of the study region (location to be determined). The main objectives for the meeting are to:

- Introduce any newly appointed alternate NCCRSG members as well as the SAT and science sub-team
- Review the draft regional profile and conduct joint fact finding to further strengthen the document
- Using the central coast regional goals and objectives as a starting point, develop and adopt north central coast regional goals and objectives.
- Conduct informational presentations (e.g., oceanography, biology/habitats, fisheries and fishing)
- Present guidelines for developing MPA proposals (e.g., MLPA SAT guidelines, DFG feasibility guidelines)
- Review other information needs and the applicability of additional support tools

III. Recap of Next Steps

A. Key next steps for NCCRSG members

1. Indicate the form in which they wish to receive their meeting materials (i.e., hard copy, emailed electronic files, electronic files on CDs).
2. Review the adopted central coast regional goals and objectives (including design and implementation considerations) and with an eye toward revising them for the north central coast region.
3. Review and propose revisions to the draft regional profile for the north central coast study region. Consider:
 - What information needs to be added to the regional profile?
 - What additional sources of information are available?
 - Editorial comments

B. Key next steps for I-Team staff

1. Transmit a copy of the adopted ground rules to the NCCRSG (attached).
2. Work with the director of DFG and the chair of the BRTF to appoint the remaining NCCRSG alternate members as well as the members of the SAT. Establish the science sub-team.
3. Organize presentations for the next NCCRSG meeting. Potential topics include: oceanographic information, biology/habitat/(including marine mammals and sea birds), and fisheries/fishing.
4. Prepare materials for next NCCRSG meeting. Key materials to include:
 - Description/definition of “network” from MLPA master plan
 - Summary of concurrent MPA processes
 - Example of regulatory language
 - Summary of MPAs adopted in the northern portion of the central coast study region
 - Summary of comments received on the draft regional profile

Attachments

1. Adopted NCCRSG ground rules (May 22, 2007)
2. NCCRSG proposed meeting schedule (May 31, 2007 draft)
3. Summary of NCCRSG member interests and expertise

Final Ground Rules

North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group

(Revised and adopted by MLPA NCCRSG, May 22, 2007)

The following ground rules have been informed by confidential interviews conducted with a cross section of the nominees for the MLPA North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (NCCRSG), including nearly all of the appointed north central coast (NCC) primary members, as well as CONCUR's professional experience. These ground rules are intended to foster and reinforce constructive interaction and deliberation among NCCRSG members; they emphasize clear communication, trust building, respect for divergent views, creative thinking, collaborative problem solving, and the pursuit of mutual gains. The NCCRSG may decide to reconsider and revise these ground rules if they appear not to be serving the NCCRSG process.

Representation

- **NCCRSG recruitment and selection.** NCCRSG members have been appointed by the director of the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) and the chair of the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) Initiative Blue Ribbon Task Force. Taken together, appointments were made to achieve a diversity of stakeholder perspectives, expertise, and geography. NCCRSG members were appointed based on their match with the following selection criteria:
 - Able to bring first hand knowledge and perspective to bear on the marine resources of the MLPA North Central Coast Study Region
 - Able to balance a north central coast regional perspective with localized knowledge
 - Willing to express fundamental interests (as opposed to fixed positions) and to clearly convey the interests of one or more important stakeholder groups
 - Capable of working collaboratively, seeking to integrate the interests of a broad range of constituencies
 - Able to access and use an effective communication network to reach stakeholders not attending the public meetings
 - Committed to completing all aspects of the charge of the NCCRSG
- **Checking back with constituencies.** NCCRSG members have been recruited based upon their ability to ably represent the views of one or more important constituencies. NCCRSG members commit to: making themselves available to communicate with interested stakeholder constituents, keeping their constituencies informed of the NCCRSG's efforts, and reporting relevant feedback to the NCCRSG. In reporting back, NCCRSG members will strive to integrate the views of their constituency rather than resorting to a "lowest common denominator" portrayal. In checking back with their constituencies, NCCRSG members will seek to avoid prejudging preliminary proposals still in development by the NCCRSG.
- **Seating of primary participants.** During NCCRSG meetings, the following participants will be seated at the main table: primary NCCRSG members, the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF) liaison, NCC Science Sub-Team members in attendance, lead MLPA Initiative and DFG staff, and project facilitators. NCCRSG alternates, other staff, and members of the public will be seated nearby.

Participation and Collaboration

- **Primary and alternate NCCRSG members.**
 - Primary NCCRSG members will make every effort to attend all of the NCCRSG meetings. Alternate members are also strongly encouraged to attend all meetings.
 - Primary NCCRSG members will work with their alternates to ensure that they are informed regarding NCCRSG deliberations. This will enable alternates to step in effectively as needed and keep the project from “backsliding.” Primary and alternate members are encouraged to confer in advance of the meetings or during meeting breaks. They are also encouraged to confer with their broader constituencies at these times.
 - Discussion at NCCRSG meetings will principally involve primary NCCRSG members, members of the NCC Science Sub-Team, and MLPA Initiative and DFG staff. Primary members may call upon their alternates to address issues outside of their areas of expertise. At their discretion, meeting facilitators may call upon alternate members. Alternate members are encouraged to actively participate in breakout sessions.
- **Active, focused participation.** Every participant is responsible for communicating his/her perspectives and interests on the issues under consideration. Voicing these perspectives is essential to enable meaningful dialogue. Everyone will participate; no one will dominate. Only one person will speak at a time. Everyone will help keep the meetings on track.
- **Respectful interaction.** Participants will respect each other’s personal integrity, values and legitimacy of interests. Participants will avoid personal attacks and stereotyping.
- **Integration and creative thinking.** In developing, reviewing and revising work products, participants will strive to be open-minded and to integrate each other’s ideas, perspectives and interests. Disagreements will be regarded as problems to be solved rather than battles to be won. Participants will attempt to reframe contentious issues and offer creative solutions to enable constructive dialogue.
- **Mutual gains approach.** Participants will work to satisfy not only their own interests but also those of other NCCRSG members. Participants are encouraged to be clear about their own interests and to recognize the important distinction between underlying interests and fixed positions.
- **Commitment to ground rules.** As a set of mutual obligations, NCCRSG members will commit to adhere to these ground rules once they are ratified. NCCRSG members are encouraged to help uphold and enforce these ground rules. If an NCCRSG member consistently deviates from these ground rules, that member may be replaced by another person upon confirmation by the director of DFG and the chair of the BRTF.

Participation of Federal, State and Local Agencies

- Given the significant portion of the north central coast study region that is under the jurisdiction of federal, state, and local agencies, the active participation of these agencies is welcome and encouraged in the north central coast process.

Commitment to process

- Participants will make a good faith effort to achieving the goals of the project on the schedule proposed.
- Participants will review meeting materials in advance of the meetings and come prepared to address the meeting objectives.
- Meetings will start on time. Participants who know that they will be absent, late, or have to leave early will inform project staff in advance and coordinate with their alternates as needed.
- Cell phones, pagers and other electronic devices will be turned off or set to “silent” mode.

Identifying and Considering Alternative MPA Proposals

- The North Central Coast Project has been structured to allow time for developing and deliberating multiple alternative MPA proposals. This process will be an iterative one, with time allocated for SAT, BRTF and public review.
- NCCRSG members will be open to proposals from other NCCRSG members or from others outside the NCCRSG.
- As part of their work, NCCRSG members will strive to identify and consider alternative MPA proposals. NCCRSG members will consider, using best readily available science and information, how each alternative proposal satisfies the goals and objectives established for the MLPA North Central Coast Study Region. The result of this deliberation is intended to allow the BRTF, DFG, and the California Fish and Game Commission to understand how the alternative proposals identified will satisfy the Marine Life Protection Act.
- The NCCRSG facilitation team will seek to foster approaches to meeting management, and to the identification and consideration of alternative MPA proposals, which maximize joint gains and mutual benefit, and also optimize efficiency.

NCCRSG Decision Rules

- NCCRSG members recognize the need to make simple process agreements to move the effort forward. NCCRSG facilitators may use “straw votes” to track progress and help the group arrive at short-term decisions to propel the process forward in an efficient fashion.
- NCCRSG members will strive to achieve a high level of consensus (i.e., broad based agreement) in developing and advancing alternative proposals for MPAs. The intent here is to strive for MPA proposals that earn broad support across NCCRSG members’

interests, not to accord NCCRS members a “de facto” veto on substantive issues. The objection of a few NCCRS members will not be grounds to impede movement.

Cooperation with North Central Coast Science Sub-Team (Science Sub-Team)

- NCCRS members will work cooperatively with the Science Sub-Team in developing options and work products. The Science Sub-Team will assist the NCCRS by reviewing draft documents, addressing scientific issues and information provided by the NCCRS, and helping to frame and refer policy challenges to the BRTF. At their discretion, MLPA Initiative and DFG staff may plan for joint meetings or work sessions of the SAT or Science Sub-Team and the NCCRS.

Briefings to the BRTF

- NCCRS members will have an opportunity to present focused briefings on the progress of MPA proposal development to the BRTF. The BRTF is expected to provide feedback on draft MPA proposals for consideration by the NCCRS.

Multi-interest Work Teams

- DFG and MLPA Initiative staff expect that cross-interest group work teams will be an essential way to develop constructive, integrative work products during and between NCCRS meetings. The aim of such work teams is to encourage multi-interest options and work products rather than work products put forward by a single bloc or interest group. It is anticipated that work teams will meet primarily by teleconference, although in-person meetings are encouraged.
- Work teams will be composed to include appropriate expertise and balance of interests. To the extent possible, work teams will be composed of primary representatives. When a primary representative is unavailable or lacks suitable expertise, an alternate representative may be selected to serve.

Media Contact

- NCCRS meetings are public and will be simultaneously webcast. Audio and video archives of the meetings will be available on the MLPA website a few days after each meeting.
- Media contacts regarding the project from a “big picture” perspective will be handled by MLPA Initiative and DFG staff. First contacts should go to Steve Martarano, DFG information officer at (916) 654-5866, (916) 804-1714, cell; or Melissa Miller-Henson, MLPA Initiative operations and communications manager at (916) 654-2506, cell (530) 400-2545.
- On occasion, reporters may call individual NCCRS members for comment about a particular issue. Members who are contacted by the media will speak only on behalf of their group or constituency, or concerning the NCCRS’s progress in the MLPA process. After commenting, please contact an MLPA communications person listed above to give them a “heads up” that a media entity is working on a story.
- NCCRS members recognize the need to maintain a balance between providing timely information to constituents and making statements to the media that could undermine

the success of the MLPA process. NCCRSG members agree to avoid: a) making statements to the media that may prejudice the project's outcome, b) representing another group's point of view or characterizing their motives, or c) stating positions on preliminary proposals while they are still in development or refinement by work teams or by the NCCRSG.

- NCCRSG members will refer requests for additional contacts to MLPA and DFG staff listed above or the NCCRSG contact list. If needed, the NCCRSG may convene a multi-interest media subcommittee to work with MLPA Initiative and DFG staff to develop briefings for the media.
- In briefing constituents, NCCRSG members are encouraged to rely primarily on key outcomes memoranda to be produced for the meetings.

Public Comment

- Designated times at NCCRSG meetings will be agendized for public comment. Efforts will be made to hold public comment at consistent time slots and keyed to important NCCRSG work product discussions. At all other times of the meeting, comments and discussion will be only among NCCRSG members and alternates, Science Sub-Team members, and MLPA Initiative and DFG staff.
- To the extent possible, public comments will be directed toward the work effort, products, or process of the NCCRSG. Comments on subjects external to the MLPA should be directed to other forums.
- Members of the public are encouraged to convey their comments to relevant colleagues who serve as NCCRSG members or alternates. Members of the public are also encouraged to submit comments in writing (via email to MLPAComments@resources.ca.gov). Written comments will be distributed to NCCRSG members.
- Public comments may be limited to up to 3 minutes per individual speaker. The NCCRSG facilitation team will exercise flexibility in allocation of speaking time depending on the number of comments.
- The MLPA Initiative Team will respond as appropriate to questions and suggestions posed in public comment portions of NCCRSG meetings.

Information Sharing and Joint Fact Finding

- NCCRSG members recognize that the MLPA North Central Coast Project relies on using the best readily available information.
- MLPA Initiative and DFG staff intend to create multiple opportunities for data sharing and joint fact finding within the NCCRSG.
- NCCRSG members are encouraged to be as specific as possible in identifying types of information they believe will support the development of work products, including alternative proposals of marine protected areas. NCCRSG members commit to share, and not withhold, relevant information to inform the revision of the *Regional Profile of the*

North Central Coast Study Region (Alder Creek/Point Arena to Pigeon Point, California)
and the identification of candidate MPAs.

- NCCRS work teams may develop preliminary MPA proposals, which should be regarded as tentative and not subject to broad distribution until they have been presented to the NCCRS. Tentative information will be treated as such.
- In the event that two or more data sets or interpretations appear to conflict, participants will work collaboratively with members of the Science Sub-Team to narrow or clarify the basis of disagreement.

Role of Facilitation Team

- The NCCRS facilitation team is non-partisan; they have no stake in any particular set of alternative MPA proposals. They will not act as an advocate for particular outcomes. The facilitators will strive to ensure that all NCCRS members clearly articulate their respective interests and to assist members to complete their work in a well-informed and efficient fashion.
- The facilitation team will use its discretion in guiding meetings and may propose agenda adjustments. The facilitation team may also use straw voting to track a range of preferences on emerging issues.
- The NCCRS facilitation team will prepare key outcomes memoranda to summarize the main results of the NCCRS meetings. These key outcomes memoranda will not strive to serve as a transcript of the meetings; rather, they will endeavor to summarize key decisions made, issues discussed, and the next steps identified for moving the project forward. The facilitators will prepare key outcomes memoranda within 7-10 days of the meetings.

California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative
North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group
Proposed Meeting Schedule
Revised May 31, 2007

2007

May 22-23	NCCRSG (Central - San Rafael)
<i>[June 19]</i>	<i>[Blue Ribbon Task Force]</i>
<i>[late June or early July]</i>	<i>[Master Plan Science Advisory Team]</i>
July 10-11	NCCRSG (South)
<i>[week of August 6]</i>	<i>[Master Plan Science Advisory Team]</i>
August 22-23	NCCRSG (North)
<i>[August-October]</i>	<i>[Joint BRTF / CA Fish and Game Commission]</i>
October 16-17	NCCRSG (Central)
<i>[November 14]</i>	<i>[Master Plan Science Advisory Team]</i>
<i>[November 29]</i>	<i>[Blue Ribbon Task Force]</i>
December 11-12	NCCRSG (South)

2008

<i>[January 8]</i>	<i>[Master Plan Science Advisory Team]</i>
<i>[January 23-24]</i>	<i>[Blue Ribbon Task Force]</i>
February 6-7	NCCRSG (North)
<i>[March 6]</i>	<i>[Master Plan Science Advisory Team]</i>
<i>[March 26-27]</i>	<i>[Blue Ribbon Task Force]</i>
May 14-15 (if needed)	NCCRSG (Central)
<i>[May 22 (if needed)]</i>	<i>[Blue Ribbon Task Force]</i>

Note that bracketed items are provided for informational purposes and have not yet been confirmed. In addition, the stakeholder group dates are *proposed* only have not yet been approved and finalized. Please check the MLPA website (www.dfg.ca.gov/mrd/mlpa) for the most current information, including meeting agendas and materials.

California MLPA North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group Summary Notes from May 22, 2007 Breakout Session Activity on Stakeholder Interests and Expertise Revised May 31, 2007

Questions discussed:

What are your interests in and uses of the ocean in the study region?
What geographic areas of the study region are you most familiar with?

Name	Interests	Uses	Geographic Areas
Allen, Sarah	Marine ecology (study of marine birds and mammals), foraging ecology and population dynamics, study of marine ecosystems, new discoveries (all taxa biodiversity inventory), protection of ecosystems and ways to protect, restoration of impaired resources and communication of science behind marine ecology	Scientific study of populations, ecosystem function, protect species of special interest and their habitats to perpetuate ecosystems for future generations, recreational fishing, birding, clam digging, swimming, sailing	Very detailed knowledge of coastal zones of Point Reyes and mouth of SF Bay and Farallon Islands, very good knowledge of Gulf of Farallones and up to Fort Ross
Ammerman, Dirk	Harvesting sea urchins, commercial fishing in general, ensuring a future for sea urchin fishing	Harvesting sea urchins, commercial and recreational fishing	Sub-region 1 and some of 2
Bernard, Bill	Rec. abalone diving, experienced w/ ARMP (abalone recovery management plan), Rec. bottom fishing, camping uses, public access points, Boating nearshore/offshore fishing and sailing, Rec. crab fishing and clamming	Rec. public activities, beach usage and surf playing/day at the beach. Spearfishing rec. in all sub regions of NCC	San Mateo county to Alder Creek in Mendocino county
Charter, Richard	Maintenance of sustainable marine ecosystems through sustainable levels of human use. Marine biology, tide pool and estuarine life, offshore oil and gas leasing moratorium protections, national marine sanctuaries.	Travel/tourism enjoyment, photography, whale watching, beach going, tide pool exploration, hiking, boating, have engaged in recreational fishing in the past, primarily during childhood and adolescent years.	Coastal waters and coastline from Golden Gate to alder creek in Mendocino County. 30-year resident of Sonoma Coast. Most familiar with waters of Gulf of the Farallones, Monterey Bay, and Cordell Bank National Marine Sanctuaries (have served for 6+ years on the Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary Advisory Council.
Churchman, Josh	Future generations ability to experience a healthy ocean. Has fished commercially in the central region of the north-central coast for over 40 years (SF Bay to Bodega Bay), Cordell S.A.C alternate	Surfing, fishing, observing	Knowledgeable of bottom types and species diversity of the area comparing what was there forty years ago to today. Dramatic changes have occurred in some places and others have remained un-molested
Estes, Tom	Dungeness crab, shrimp trawling, salmon fishing, hook and line fishing	Commercial crab fishing, shrimp trawling and salmon fishing, sport fishing; abalone, salmon, rockfish. Also surf (nets) and night fishing	Halfmoon bay to Alder Pt.
Fastenau, Henry	By employment/choice: diving and boating. Former commercial fisherman and recreational diving. Seen human impact over the past 45-50 yrs. Would like to see broad agreement among users for balanced use and protection.	Support scientific study, physical oceanography, fisheries enhancement, training, relaxation	Sub region 2 and Bodega Bay/harbor

Name	Interests	Uses	Geographic Areas
Faurot-Daniels, Ellen	Background in marine science; sea otters/nearshore ecology; marine birds and mammals. Work with marine conservation policy statewide. Knowledge of coastal environmentally sensitive sites (via oil spill response planning). From coastal commission can bring info. on Critical Coastal Areas. Member of Central Coast RSG, worked on "hybrid" proposal; want to see good linking between CC and NCC. CA Coastal Commission only interested if physical access limited or prohibited	Recreation: non-consumptive diving/ kayaking, beach access, whale watching	San Mateo coast generally, although need to know SF, Marin, Sonoma counties better
Grenell, Peter	Sustainable fishing, marine habitat conservation, ocean recreation, water quality/land-based pollution, socioeconomic impacts of MPAs on fishing industry and coastal communities, MPA impacts on harbor operations, climate change	Commercial fishing, recreational fishing, surfing, recreational boating, marine research, public access	San Mateo County Coast and Coastal waters, Farallons sanctuary waters, Sonoma Coast
Johnson, Rick	Ecosystem health, biodiversity. Preserve some areas for natural process, education, Marin Audubon Conservation Committee	Docent-tide pools, elephant seals, whales. Dunes-field trips. Birding-(also teach birding by ear), Small scale recreational fishing	San Mateo Coast, Pt. Reyes. Boating from Pillar Point, Bodega Bay, Tamales Bay. Some trips along the north coast. Currently a docent in Pt. Reyes. Was a docent at Fitzgerald
Jones, Ken	Inshore areas- surf, rock, and pier fishing	Shore fishing, from all areas in study region, particularly piers (although somewhat limited in this area). Some limited experience in abalone picking	Primarily sub-region 1-Pt. Arena down to Stewart's Pt. Also very familiar with sub-region 3, some sub-region 4 and rockcod fishing in sub-region 6
Koe, Francesca	Freediving, scuba diving, and rebreathers. I am most interested in sharing the wonder and power of our ocean as a resource with the people I teach and the friends I dive with. I am especially in kelp and coral ecology.	All forms of diving, kayaking, and boating	Salt Point, Farallon Islands, Point Bonita and SF Bay
Kogan, Irina	The Gulf of the Farallons National Marine Sanctuary manages the marine environment from Ano Nuevo to Bodega Head. Ecosystem protection in that region is a primary interest	Has conducted deep sea surveys off central CA, recreational use of ocean estuaries	Particularly familiar with the resources and uses of region 5 but have general understanding of sub-regions 3,4, and 6. Expertise is in habitat distribution (seabed mapping). There is seabird/ marine mammal expertise at my office, also with tide pools
Mattusch, Tom	Healthy and abundant variety of marine life	Fishing, crabbing, squidding, whale watching, marine mammal and bird viewing, research, touring, ash scattering, photography, diving	Pigeon Pt. to Pt Reyes, Golden state to Farallons. Limited diving and fishing experience Pt. Reyes to above Pt. Arena
McHenry, Michael	Wetfish, squid, anchovy, sardine, mackerel, Rock cod, crab, salmon	Make my living (with ocean resources) and provide various groups with as much knowledge as possible to help their judgment on habitats and local science	Pigeon Pt. to Jenner (Russian river), Farallon islands
Mellor, John	How to create a holistic approach to resource management patterns like perma-culture in agriculture where the consumer is connected with the environment and the producer with small scale operations are favored over industrial conglomerates	Commercial fishing, currently for crabs, salmon, and nearshore rockfish for economic as well as mental and spiritual well-being. Fisheries closures in MPAs is an admission that management doesn't work.	Currently Pt. Arena to Pigeon Pt.
Merrilees, Craig	I'm concerned about the general degradation of the planet 3/5 of which is ocean. I'm also concerned about people who depend on the ocean for their living.	Recreational fishing, diving, surfing, kayaking, and source of wild seafood (commercially produced)	Very familiar with Pt Bonita (Golden Gate) to Pt Reyes. Generally familiar with points north and south.
Morgan, Lance	Biodiversity, sustainable fisheries and impact on environment, habitat conservation, science, scuba diving, beach going, wildlife/bird/marine mammal watching abalone diving, shore and salmon fishing, kayak-Tamales Bay	Research urchins metapopulations, Cordell Bank SAC	Sonoma and Marin coast, Pt. Reyes

Name	Interests	Uses	Geographic Areas
Murray, Samantha	Interested in enhancing the ecosystems and wildlife that use the NCC. I want to ensure that the species and habitat therein can be enjoyed by future generations who want to dive, fish, surf, kayak, bird watch, or otherwise appreciate this spectacular place.	Diving, surfing, fish consumption, scientific research, kayaking, bird watching, fishing, mammal watching, etc	Evolving, learning as much as I can everyday. Specific knowledge of scattered areas throughout sub region 1, 2,3. General knowledge of Pt. Reyes, seabirds of SF area and Marin. Have access to thousands of users in study area who have intimate knowledge. Also Audubon and kayakers, etc.
Nelson, Kellyx	Sustainable fisheries, sustainable regional economies, sustainable extractive recreation, sustainable non-extractive recreation, environmental education, intertidal/subtidal ecology, win-win scenarios.	Scuba diving, abalone diving, spear fishing, aesthetic enjoyment, surfing, environmental education, tide pooling, visiting the beach/	Mendocino coast, upland/terrestrial marine resources - multiple watersheds in coastal San Mateo County. Fitzgerald Marine Reserve/Pillar Point Harbor.
Neubacher, Don	Global climate change, "Fish Forever", "Ocean Health", recreational kayaking fishing, etc. National Park System~80 miles of coastline, grew up in Healdsburg, Sonoma County, growth in Sonoma beaches	Fished Russian River, recreation/tourism, Pt. Reyes contributes over \$100 million to economy, research~80 projects underway.	Marin, Sonoma, SF coasts. Duxbury Reef to Tamales Bay, Farallone Islands
Pierce, Paul	Recreational fishing from boat/shore, bird watching, visiting the beach with my family, tide pool exploration	Salmon fishing, halibut fishing, rock cod, clam digging, surf fishing	Halfmoon bay/San Mateo coast/ Pedro Point, Colorado reef, Marin coastline, Tamales bay, Bodega Bay, Jenner area, Duxbury middlegrounds
Roberts, Santi	Conservation, ensuring most ecological protection for least short-term economic impact, vibrant coastal communities, including rec. fishing and non-destructive commercial fishing	Diving, mostly south of study area	Broad scale data analysis of entire region
Sleeter, Ben	Health and vitality of ocean resources to provide sustainable uses both consumptive and non-consumptive of marine resources. Improving the abundance of ocean resources. Enhancing the quality of the recreational angling experience	Recreational angler and ocean enthusiast	Pt. Reyes to Pigeon pt. and Farallon Islands (sub-region 3-6)
Smith, Fred	Ensuring adequate habitat and food for sea mammals and birds, while providing various opportunities for predator/prey relationships, protecting local commercial fishing, sustainable fisheries	Kayaking (Salt Pt., Pt. Arena, Sonoma state beaches, Tamales Bay and Drakes Estero), whale watching up and down the coast (represents a wide cross section of members- 2/3 of which are in Marin county	Setting up a membership team to look more closely at the regional profile and how best to set up a MPA system. *honestly far from an expert on particular locations on this map
Swolgaard, Craig	Preservation of representative samples of California's diverse marine ecosystem, it's biodiversity, scenic values, and recreational potential. Also areas that will enhance public understanding and appreciation of intact marine environments and their resources.	Recreational fishing, sport diving, interpretive/educational access, surfing, kayaking, sightseeing, etc.	State parks has units scattered fairly evenly along the entire region, possibly a larger concentration north of San Francisco. Personally, I've been a diver with extensive experience along the entire coast since 1968
Tavasieff, Ed	Commercial fishing, diving, recreational fishing, surfing, a healthy ocean complex able to support meaningful involvement of all user groups and public. To the extent possible, not exclusionary.	See above	Point Reyes to Pedro Point, although I have fished down in areas other than the above mentioned areas. Such as black point, ft ross, Gualala, etc.
White, Sean	Kayak fishing and diving for nearshore rockfish, salmon, halibut, crab & abalone. Representing Great White Kayaks and 1,000+ members on NCSR. Also a fisheries biologist in my other life	Travels all over, but in the north-central coast uses many locations from Moat Creek south to Tamales Bay. Favorite areas include Hog Island and Lawson's in Tamales; Ft. Ross, Stillwater, Fisk area, Fish rocks, Saunders, and Moat Creek	Southern Mendocino to Tamales
Wilson, Bob	Marine mammals and seabirds	Rescue and rehabilitation of marine mammals, marine mammal surveys, biological surveys, public outreach	San Mateo, Marin, and Sonoma. Mostly knows the beach areas of San Mateo, Marin, and Sonoma and the wildlife in those areas
Yokomizo, Jay	Sportfishing, whale watching	Fishing coast and Farallons	Pillar Pt. to Pt. Reyes and out 50 fm at Farallons

**California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative
North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group**

AGENDA – MEETING #2

July 10-11, 2007

Best Western Lighthouse Hotel

Pacifica, CA

Revised July 11, 2007

MEETING OBJECTIVES

1. Introduce newly-appointed NCCRSG and Science Sub-Team members
2. Continue review of draft regional profile; initiate joint fact finding
3. Using adopted central coast study region goals/objectives as a starting point, discuss, develop, and adopt north central coast regional goals and objectives
4. Present informational briefings on topics of ecosystems, invertebrate harvest and mariculture, seabirds and marine mammals, and commercial fisheries in the study region
5. Present guidelines for developing MPA proposals
6. Present status of other information gathering efforts
7. Outline preparations for third NCCRSG meeting

MEETING AGENDA

Day 1	
9:30 a.m.	<i>Arrival, refreshments and greetings</i>
10:00 a.m.	Welcome, agenda review, and brief introductions (Handouts A-B)
10:15 a.m.	Updates – Follow-up tasks from May NCCRSG meeting (Attachments 1-2)
10:25 a.m.	Review and discuss draft regional profile (Handout E) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review key comments received and I-Team responses• Provide additional targeted feedback; focus discussion on key data needs or most important revisions• Identify next steps to revise regional profile: introduce afternoon breakout session and follow-up work team activity to provide input to subregional summaries
11:25 a.m.	Provide orientation to MPA goals and objectives (Attachment 3, Handout F)
11:40 a.m.	Public comment
11:55 a.m.	<i>Lunch (provided on site for regional stakeholder group members)</i>
12:40 p.m.	Develop, discuss, and revise north central coast regional goals and objectives in preparation for adoption (Attachment 4)
2:25 p.m.	<i>Break</i>
2:40 p.m.	Presentations on specific features of the MLPA North Central Coast Study Region, and discussion (Handouts G-J) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Marine ecosystems and habitats – Dr. Mark Carr (University of California, Santa Cruz)• Seabirds and marine mammals – Gerry McChesney (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service) and Sarah Allen (National Park Service)• Invertebrate harvest and mariculture – Pete Kalvass and John Ugoretz (California Department of Fish and Game)

Day 1 (continued)	
4:25 p.m.	Joint fact-finding breakout session activity: Initiate NCCRSG input on subregional summaries
5:45 p.m.	<i>Adjourn</i>
6:45 p.m.	<i>NCCRSG dinner (offsite for NCCRSG members and staff)</i>

Day 2	
8:30 a.m.	Review agenda for Day 2 and questions from Day 1
8:45 a.m.	Complete review and adoption of north central coast regional goals and objectives
9:30 a.m.	Present guidelines for developing MPA proposals, and discuss (Attachment 5-7, Handout K) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MLPA guidelines and terminology • DFG feasibility guidelines • MLPA SAT guidelines
10:30 a.m.	<i>Break</i>
10:45 a.m.	Present and discuss preliminary evaluation of existing north central coast MPAs (Handouts C, L)
11:30 a.m.	Present policy guidance (Attachment 8)
12:15 p.m.	<i>Lunch (provided on site for regional stakeholder group members)</i>
1:00 p.m.	Public comment
1:15 p.m.	Presentations on specific features of study region, and discussion (Handout M) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commercial fisheries – Susan Ashcraft (California Department of Fish and Game)
1:45 p.m.	Provide regional overview of data layers (Attachment 9, Handout N)
2:45 p.m.	Updates on other information gathering efforts: commercial, recreational consumptive, recreational non-consumptive (Handout D)
3:15 p.m.	Next steps and preparations for next NCCRSG meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review objectives for meeting #3 • Plan work team meeting on subregional summaries (July 17, 2007)
3:30 p.m.	<i>Adjourn</i>

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

1. Definition of “network”
2. Marine Managed Areas Improvement Act (MMAIA)
3. *How is Your MPA Doing?*

4. MLPA staff analysis of Regional Goals and Objectives
5. Guidelines for developing marine protected area proposals
6. *Marine Managed Areas: Best Practices for Boundary Making*
7. Summary of adopted central coast MPAs
8. Memo regarding central coast process policy guidance
9. Users guide to Internet map service (IMS)

LIST OF HANDOUTS

- A. Updated NCCRSG contact information
- B. Roster of MLPA SAT members
- C. Preliminary evaluation of existing state marine protected areas in the MLPA North Central Coast Study Region
- D. Description of commercial fishing socioeconomic data collection
- E. PowerPoint presentation: North Central Coast Regional Profile Comments
- F. PowerPoint presentation: MPA Goals and Objectives, Why do They Matter?
- G. PowerPoint presentation: Habitats and Ecosystems of the North Central Region
- H. PowerPoint presentation: Seabirds and Marine Mammals of the North Central Coast Area of California
- I. PowerPoint presentation: Marine Invertebrate Fisheries of the MLPA North Central Coast Study Region
- J. PowerPoint presentation: Marine Aquaculture
- K. PowerPoint presentation: Guidelines for Developing Alternative MPA Proposals
- L. PowerPoint presentation: Preliminary Evaluation of Existing North Central Coast Study Region Marine Protected Areas
- M. PowerPoint presentation: Commercial Fisheries in the North Central Coast Study Region: Perspectives from Fishermen
- N. PowerPoint presentation: Overview of spatial data layers available for MPA Planning

Key Outcomes Memorandum

Date: July 19, 2007

To: Members, MLPA North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group

From: Scott McCreary and Eric Poncelet, CONCUR, Inc.

Re: Key Outcomes Memorandum – July 10-11, 2007 Meeting

cc: MLPA Initiative Staff and California Department of Fish and Game MLPA Staff

Executive Summary – Key Outcomes

On July 10-11, 2007, the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) Initiative North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (NCCRSG) participated in its second meeting in Pacifica, CA. **Key outcomes** from the meeting are as follows:

- NCCRSG members discussed and revised a set of provisional regional goals and objectives. Then, the NCCRSG took action and unanimously agreed to forward the revised goals and objectives to the MLPA Science Advisory Team (SAT) for their review and consideration of the measurability of the objectives as worded.
- The NCCRSG will consider this SAT advice, make final revisions, and adopt the regional goals and objectives at its August 22-23, 2007 meeting.
- I-Team staff summarized comments received on the draft regional profile to date. NCCRSG members provided additional comments and input.
- SAT members and California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) staff provided informational briefings on the topics of marine ecosystems and habitats, invertebrate harvest and mariculture, seabirds and marine mammals, and commercial fisheries.
- NCCRSG members worked with SAT members in a joint fact-finding breakout session activity to follow up on additional details from the informational briefings and to compile input on these topics to the subregional summary sections of the draft regional profile.
- I-Team staff presented guidance to inform the development of alternative marine protected area (MPA) proposals.
- The I-Team presented a preliminary evaluation of existing north central coast MPAs. The I-Team will forward this analysis to the SAT for review at the SAT's August 14 meeting.
- I-Team staff provided updates on several additional information gathering efforts, including: socioeconomic analysis of commercial fishing, consumptive recreational fishing use, and non-consumptive use in the study region.
- NCCRSG members received an introduction to the Internet Map Site (IMS), where data layers are accessible for viewing (www.marinemap.org/mlpa).
- I-Team staff announced the appointment of eleven new NCCRSG members (one new primary and ten new alternates).

Key next steps are listed in section III below.

I. Meeting Participants and Materials

Twenty-two NCCRSR primary members and sixteen alternate members participated in the meeting.

MLPA Science Advisory Team members participating in the meeting included: Sarah Allen, Mark Carr, Caroline Hermans, Gerry McChesney, Steve Morgan, Karina Nielsen, and Astrid Scholz.

MLPA Initiative and California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) staff—collectively known as the “I-Team”—staffed the meeting.

Meeting materials may be found on the MLPA website at:
http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mrd/mlpa/meeting_071007.html

II. Key Outcomes

A. Provisional Regional Goals and Objectives Discussed and Revised; Agreement to Forward to MLPA SAT for Review and Consideration

1. Purpose of goals and objectives

I-Team staff provided an overview of the purpose of goals and objectives in MPA design and development. Key points include:

- The overall MPA network should lead toward achieving the MLPA’s goals.
- Each MPA will have objectives that work toward portions of the MLPA’s goals.
- Objectives are needed to develop monitoring plans.
- Goals and objectives guide the adaptive management process.
- Goals and objectives will help when developing proposals and selecting indicators.

2. NCCRSR comments on the adopted central coast regional goals and objectives

NCCRSR members offered a variety of comments on the adopted central coast regional goals and objectives. These comments were focused on adding clarity and specificity to the goals and objectives and making them more measurable and specific to the north central coast study region. Key comments included:

- NCCRSR members requested that the SAT review and comment on the relative measurability of the various proposed objectives. I-Team staff committed to agendize this topic at the SAT’s next meeting (August 14, 2007).
- Include a statement in the introductory section that acknowledges that MPAs are one of several tools for managing marine resources.
- Reference the sources and definitions of key terms such as “natural diversity” and “natural abundance.”
- Expand goal 2, objective 2 to address protection of larval source areas and/or protection of breeding, rearing, and foraging areas.
- Expand objectives under goal 3 to include reference to educational and cultural uses (both consumptive and non-consumptive).

- Consider ways of expanding the original goal 3, objective 4 (on consumptive recreational uses) to allow for other means to protect and enhance recreational experiences beyond improving size and age structure of marine populations. The SAT will be asked to help draft this language.
- Revise goal 6, objective 1 to indicate that this is part of an adaptive management process.
- Create a new design consideration in the MPA design process focused on incorporating existing public coastal access points.
- Create a new design consideration to address the benefits and drawbacks of siting MPAs near to or remote from public access.
- Create a new design consideration that incorporates consideration of impacts of climate change, distributional shifts in marine species, and community alterations.

3. NCCRS agreed to forward revised NCC goals and objectives to SAT for review

Following NCCRS deliberations on day one, the I-Team digested and synthesized the NCCRS's comments on the draft north central coast regional goals and objectives and prepared a revised draft. On day two, NCCRS members reviewed and refined the regional goals and objectives further and agreed unanimously to forward these "provisional regional goals and objectives" to the SAT for review of their measurability. The revised provisional regional goals and objectives are attached in a separate document as Attachment 1.

This revised version of the Regional Goals and Objectives can also be used as a tool by NCCRS members to brief their respective constituents and to elicit any essential additional feedback prior to NCCRS adoption in August.

B. NCCRS Provided Input to Draft Regional Profile

1. Comments and clarifications

I-Team staff summarized the comments on the draft regional profile received from NCCRS members and the general public through June 20, 2007. NCCRS members then offered additional comments on the draft regional profile. Some members requested additional clarity, while others offered new information or suggested corrections. Among these comments and clarifications were the following:

- NCCRS members asked to be informed of changes to the regional profile and the geodatabase. It is important that the NCCRS work from the most current scientific information.
- Bathymetric data from Dr. Rick Kvitek's research will be incorporated to the document once this information is available (expected in August timeframe). NCCRS members requested that any changes to the current bathymetric data be highlighted.
- Streamline the document to include only information relevant to MPA development.
- Incorporate additional information on specific species (e.g., crab and bat rays) being fished off of piers.
- The regional profile would benefit from a clear definition of "agriculture" that specifies the associated resource uses.

- Clarify the term “active fishermen,” as there are many fishermen who have permits but do not currently fish. This distinction could be described in the subregional summaries.
- Refine the working definition of “estuaries” and be explicit about which ones were included in the region and why.
- Expand the description of the regional and global importance of the north coast study region as part of the California Current large marine ecosystem
- The I-Team clarified that the SAT is intending to develop a list of depleted species and a revised list of species likely to benefit specifically for the north central coast study region.

I-Team staff will incorporate these comments into the next revision of the document, which is expected in the September 2007 timeframe.

2. Joint fact-finding breakout session activity to inform subregional summaries

NCCRSG members participated with SAT members in a joint fact-finding breakout session. The purpose of the activity was to provide additional information to the subregional summaries section of the Regional Profile. NCCRSG members participated in one of three breakout groups focused respectively on the topics of: 1) marine ecosystems and habitats, 2) invertebrate harvest and mariculture, and 3) seabirds and marine mammals.

In the breakout groups, SAT members shared their knowledge on the important and unique features of each subregion relative to the topic area in focus. NCCRSG members participated by asking clarifying questions and sharing their own knowledge of the study region. I-Team staff took detailed notes from the breakout group discussions and will use these to inform the subregional summaries.

This breakout session was an early opportunity for NCCRSG members to contribute knowledge and information to the subregional summaries. Additional joint-fact finding opportunities will be scheduled for future NCCRSG meetings.

3. Next steps: Ongoing comments and work team activity

Comments on the draft regional profile are still being accepted. I-Team staff is particularly interested in input regarding the subregional summaries. Staff will incorporate comments received into the next revision of the document, which is expected in the September 2007 timeframe.

The NCCRSG agreed to convene a work team to continue progress on the draft regional profile and to serve as a review committee. This work team will meet in the August time frame at a date/time and location to be determined. Participation via teleconference will be possible although in-person participation is encouraged. The work team's purpose will be to confirm the revisions to the draft regional profile and oversee continued development of the subregional summaries.

Work team participants include: Ed Tavasieff, Paul Pierce, Bill Bernard, Karen Reyna (or Irina Kogan), Bob Breen, Samantha Murray, and Fred Smith.

C. Informational Briefings Presented

SAT members and I-Team staff provided informational briefings on four key topics:

- 1) Marine ecosystems and habitats (Dr. Mark Carr, UCSC)
- 2) Invertebrate harvest and mariculture (Pete Kalvass and John Ugoretz, DFG)
- 3) Seabirds and marine mammals (Gerry McChesney, USFWS, and Dr. Sarah Allen, NPS)
- 4) Commercial fisheries (Susan Ashcraft, DFG, with input from several NCCRSR members)

Following each presentation, NCCRSR members offered additional detail or made clarifying comments. Key comments included the following:

- SAT member Mark Carr confirmed that humans are considered part of “ecosystems” for the purpose of analyzing ecosystem structure and function.
- NCCRSR members requested that I-Team staff provide additional information on the implications of the status of the Stornetta Ranch for invertebrate harvest in the study region.
- NCCRSR members asked for additional information on diseases caused from introduced species.
- NCCRSR members asked about trends in the populations of various species of marine mammals in the study region.
- NCCRSR members noted that a small wetfish fishery still exists in the north central coast study region.
- I-Team staff clarified that MPAs are not intended to be used to restrict out of state boats from fishing in the study region. This issue is more appropriately addressed by the California Fish and Game Commission or the Pacific Fisheries Management Council.

I-Team staff indicated that additional informational briefings would be presented on other substantive topics (e.g., oceanography, seafloor mapping, MPA connectivity, recreational uses) at subsequent NCCRSR meetings.

D. Guidance for MPA Development

1. Key sources of guidance

I-Team staff presented an overview of key guidance informing the MPA development process. Key sources of guidance included the following:

- a. Guidance from the MLPA. I-Team staff encouraged NCCRSR members to review in detail the key sections of the MLPA (i.e., sections 2853, 2856(a)(2), 2857(b)-(d)).
- b. DFG feasibility guidelines. I-Team staff presented DFG’s statement of feasibility criteria. I-Team staff emphasized that DFG review of MPA proposals will be guided primarily by these criteria.
- c. MLPA SAT guidelines. I-Team staff summarized the current SAT guidelines as listed in the draft Master Plan. A more detailed presentation on the source of these guidelines will take place at the next NCCRSR meeting.

I-Team staff also presented policy guidance on the topics of: socioeconomic considerations, qualitative standards of the MLPA, fishery management in relation to the MLPA, and existing fishing regulations and statutes related to development of MPAs.

2. Comments and clarifications

NCCRSG members posed clarifying questions regarding the guidance presented. Key questions and clarifications included the following:

- I-Team staff clarified that the SAT is planning to consider the existing SAT guidelines at their August 14, 2007 meeting. They will review the existing guidelines in light of current modeling information and the presence of offshore islands in the north central coast study region.
- I-Team staff clarified that “doughnut zones” are acceptable for islands (e.g., the Farallon Islands), but depth contour boundaries should still be avoided.
- I-Team staff confirmed that, in cases where state marine parks (SMPs) are proposed, DFG and California State Parks have established a process where these MPAs will begin as State Marine Conservation Areas and then be converted to State Marine Parks.
- NCCRSG members requested guidance on the possibility of establishing “no disturbance” MPAs. NCCRSG members also asked if critical distances associated with vessel transit should be treated as a design consideration. I-Team staff responded that while MPAs in general do not prohibit access or transit, these restrictions are possible. Examples were given from existing MPAs (e.g., Big Creek State Marine Reserve, and Bodega State Marine Reserve) where anchoring is prohibited.
- NCCRSG members asked whether “seasonal MPAs” could be established. I-Team staff responded that seasonal restrictions are most appropriately handled by fishery management regulations and can be addressed as “special closure” designations, such as the brown pelican fledgling area at Anacapa Island.
- NCCRSG members asked whether MPA regulations can contain bag limits. I-Team staff responded that “reduced bag limits” can be specified in MPAs, although creating a regulatory regime with variable bag limits presents a complication for enforcement staff.
- I-Team staff noted that central coast MPAs may contribute to north central coast regional replication, and that this will be discussed at next NCCRSG meeting.
- I-Team staff will provide the adopted regulations for the central coast process to serve as models for the NCC study region.
- I-Team staff clarified that adaptive management review of MPAs by the Fish and Game Commission will take place approximately every 5 years. Adaptive management will also depend on the objectives of individual MPAs. For example, the objective of rebuilding stocks will be achieved sooner than the objective of protecting habitat (more long term). Federal agency representatives on the NCCRSG reiterated their commitment to assisting in the adaptive management process.

E. Preliminary Evaluation of North Central Coast MPAs

The I-Team presented its preliminary evaluation of existing north central coast MPAs. The I-Team will forward this preliminary analysis to the SAT for its review at its August 14 meeting.

NCCRSG members asked a few clarifying questions. Key I-Team clarifications included the following:

- NCCRSG members will have several options available to them as they craft proposals for new MPAs. These range from the option of improving the existing MPAs or entirely replacing all MPAs them with other MPAs.
- State Parks cannot change the regulations for state marine parks (SMPs) adopted by the Fish and Game Commission. However, State Parks can promulgate “park rules” that may impact allowable activities within park boundaries. A State Parks representative further clarified that it is in the interest of State Parks to maintain the status quo regarding access.

F. Updates on Other Information Gathering Efforts

I-Team staff provided updates on several additional information gathering efforts:

1. Socioeconomic analysis of commercial fishing in the north central coast study region

Ecotrust has been contracted to conduct surveys of commercial fishing interests to capture spatially explicit socioeconomic information. A presentation of the draft data set will made to the NCCRSG at its August 22-23, 2007 meeting. Appropriate data will be made available for use through the mapping tools.

2. Consumptive recreational data

The California Recreational Fisheries Survey (CRFS) database is currently undergoing revisions. These revisions will not be completed before December 2007. The changes affect estimates of effort (and thus projected landings) for several modes of fishing. Survey data including spatial data are based on actual samples and not on expansions, and therefore are not affected. The database is publicly available and can be queried on-line.

3. Non-consumptive use data

The I-Team has distributed a “request for proposals” to collect spatial data for non-consumptive uses and is considering a proposal from the National MPA center.

G. Introduction to the Internet Map Service (IMS)

I-Team staff presented an introduction to the IMS. NCCRSG members may access the IMS at: www.marinemap.org/mlpa. NCCRSG members may request assistance from DFG offices or I-Team GIS staff to access the IMS. They may also request a DVD with the data layers (along with the Arc reader program).

NCCRSG members requested that they be informed of major changes to the IMS. They also requested that important meta-data be incorporated into the data layers when appropriate.

H. Update on NCCRSR Membership

I-Team staff announced that nearly a dozen new members had been appointed to the NCCRSR since the May NCCRSR meeting. This includes a new primary member representing tribal interests as well as ten new alternate members representing a variety of other stakeholder interests and perspectives. The I-Team distributed an updated NCCRSR roster to group members.

I. Public comment

The meeting included designated public comment periods on both day one and day two. Several members of the public provided comments. One spoke to the need for more DFG funding for enforcement and for more outreach concerning the consequences of poaching in the NCC study region. Several addressed the potential benefits of designating Fitzgerald marine reserve as a state marine reserve.

The I-Team announced that Elizabeth Pope-Smith (DFG) will be on point to respond to questions raised by the public that cannot be addressed during the public comment period.

J. Objectives for NCCRSR Meeting #2

The next NCCRSR meeting is scheduled for August 22-23, 2007 in the northern part of the study region (location to be determined). The main objectives for the meeting are to:

- Consider SAT feedback and adopt regional goals and objectives
- Continue joint fact-finding and development of the regional profile
- Present informational briefings (potential topics include: oceanography, seafloor mapping results, water quality, SAT guidelines and MPA connectivity, and recreational consumptive use)
- Provide information and tutorial on the decision-support tool
- Initiate the process for designing MPA proposals

III. Recap of Next Steps

A. Key next steps for NCCRSR members

1. Continue to familiarize yourselves with the guidance for MPA development presented in the MLPA and the draft Master Plan. (For next NCCRSR meeting)
2. Convene a work team (consisting of Ed Tavasieff, Paul Pierce, Bill Bernard, Karen Reyna (or Irina Kogan), Bob Breen, Samantha Murray, and Fred Smith) to review revisions to draft regional profile. A provisional meeting date will be set in August.

B. Key next steps for I-Team staff

1. Incorporate revisions reflecting the day two deliberations on the “provisional regional goals and objectives,” and forward it to the SAT for review at the next SAT meeting. (August 14, 2007)
2. Agendize SAT discussion of existing SAT guidance for MPA development. Focus on particularities of north central coast study region (e.g., existence of off-shore islands) and any recent modeling developments. (August 14, 2007)

3. Incorporate NCCRSB comments on the regional profile into the next iteration of the document. This includes input from the joint fact-finding breakout session activity on the subregional summaries. (Ongoing; revision by early September 2007)
4. Prepare a presentation on the implications of the adopted central coast MPAs for the north central coast study region. This includes implications for replication in the north central coast study region. (For next NCCRSB meeting)

Attachments

1. Draft Provisional North Central Coast Regional Goals and Objectives, revised July 19, 2007 based on NCCRSB discussions at July 10-11, 2007 meeting (to be forwarded to the MLPA SAT for consideration at the SAT's August 14, 2007 SAT meeting).

California MLPA North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group
Draft Provisional Regional Goals and Objectives for
Review by the MLPA SAT at its August 14, 2007 Meeting
Revised July 19, 2007

The text below reflects revisions made at the NCCRSNG's July 10-11, 2007 meeting. At the meeting, the NCCRSNG unanimously agreed to forward the revised goals and objectives to the SAT for their review and consideration of the measurability of the objectives as worded.

[General comment: As per the NCCRSNG request, the I-Team asked the SAT to review and comment on the relative measurability of the various proposed objectives. Within the monitoring plan for the Central Coast MPAs, there is a review of indicators based on the adopted objectives. Some of the adopted objectives are more easily measured than others. See pages 147-155 of the draft Master Plan.]

Introduction

The members of the North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (NCCRSNG) agree that regional goals, objectives, and design and implementation considerations are all very important in the development of an effective system of marine protected areas (MPAs) that have stakeholder support. Regional goals are statements of what the regional MPAs are ultimately trying to achieve (Pomeroy et al. 2004)¹. The regional goals are largely taken directly from the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) itself. Regional objectives are more specific measurable statements of what ~~must be~~MPAs ~~may~~ accomplished to attain a related goal (Pomeroy et al. 2004). The NCCRSNG recognizes that MPAs are one among a suite of tools to manage marine resources.

[Comment: the I-Team does not believe it is necessary to list everything that the MLPA is not supposed to address.]

Design considerations are additional factors that may help fulfill provisions of the MLPA related to facilitating enforcement, encouraging public involvement, and incorporating socio-economic considerations, while meeting the act's goals and guidelines. Design considerations will be applied as the location, category (reserve, park or conservation area), size and other characteristics of potential MPAs are being developed (~~Kirlin Memo, 8/22/05~~). Design considerations are cross cutting (they apply to all MPAs) and are not necessarily measurable (~~Kirlin Memo, 8/22/05~~). MPA alternatives developed by the NCCRSNG should include analysis of how the proposal addresses both regional goals and objectives and design guidelines: (~~Kirlin Memo, 8/22/05~~).

[Reference Kirlin memo as a footnote.]

¹ Pomeroy R.S., J.E. Parks, and L.M. Watson. 2004. How is your MPA doing? A Guidebook of Natural and Social Indicators for Evaluating Marine Protected Area Management Effectiveness. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK. xvi + 216 p. (Accessed 17 January 2004). <http://effectivempa.noaa.gov/guidebook/guidebook.html>.

Provisional Regional Objectives

Goal 1. To protect the natural diversity and abundance² of marine life, and the structure, function, and integrity of marine ecosystems.

1. ~~Protect/Include~~Protect areas of high species diversity and maintain species diversity and abundance, consistent with natural fluctuations, of populations in representative habitats. [Question for SAT: does the SAT have comments on the respective measurability of these alternate terms (objectives 1 and 2)?]
2. ~~Protect/Include~~Protect areas with diverse habitat types in close proximity to each other.
3. Protect natural size and age structure and genetic diversity of populations in representative habitats.
4. Protect natural trophic structure and food webs in representative habitats.
5. Protect ecosystem structure, function, integrity and ecological processes to facilitate recovery of natural communities from disturbances both natural and human induced.

[Comment: The suggestion was made to include reference to “qualitative stability.” The I-Team does not see an obvious place to insert this phrase.]

[Comment: NCCRSG members requested a definition of “natural.” The master plan provides a definition of “natural diversity” and “natural abundance.” MPAs will allow us to better understand the impact of humans on natural diversity and abundance.]

Goal 2. To help sustain, conserve, and protect marine life populations, including those of economic value, and rebuild those that are depleted.

1. Help protect and/or rebuild populations of rare, threatened, endangered, depleted, or overfished species, where identified, and the habitats and ecosystem functions upon which they rely.³ [Comment: “and/or” is a good construction because some species are naturally rare and while not requiring rebuilding may require protection.]
2. ~~Protect larval sources and~~Sustain or increase~~restore~~ reproductive capacity of species most likely to benefit from MPAs through retention of large, mature individuals.

² Natural dDiversity is the species richness of a community or area when protected from, or not subjected to, human-induced change (drawn from Allaby 1998 and Kelleher 1992). Natural abundance is the total number of individuals in a population protected from, or not subjected to, human-induced change (adapted from Department 2004 and Kelleher 1992).

³ [Comment: Some NCCRSG members requested that a footnote be added stating that the terms threatened, endangered, depleted, or overfished are used in reference to their standard legal definitions.]

protection of larval source areas, and/or protection of breeding, foraging and rearing areas.

3. Protect selected species and the habitats on which they depend while allowing the commercial and/or recreational harvest of migratory, highly mobile, or other species where appropriate through the use of state marine conservation areas and state marine parks.

Goal 3. To improve recreational, educational, and study opportunities provided by marine ecosystems that are subject to minimal human disturbances, and to manage these uses in a manner consistent with protecting biodiversity.

1. Ensure some MPAs are close to population centers, coastal access points, and/or research and education institutions and include areas of traditional educational and non-consumptive recreational and cultural use, and are accessible for recreational, educational, and study opportunities.
2. Protect or enhance cultural and recreational experiences, including collecting and recreational fishing, by ... improving size and age structure of marine populations[science team, craft something measurable - including minimal human disturbances].
3. To enhance the likelihood of scientifically valid studies, replicate appropriate MPA designations, habitats or control areas (including areas open to fishing) to the extent possible.
4. ~~Develop collaborative scientific monitoring and research projects evaluating MPAs that link with fisheries management information needs, classroom science curricula, volunteer dive programs, and fishermen of all ages, and identify participants.~~
4. ~~Protect or enhance recreational experience by ensuring natural size and age structure of marine populations. [Moved up to #2]~~
1. ~~Retain existing public coastal access for all resource users in a manner consistent with protecting biodiversity. [See new design consideration #10.]~~

Goal 4. To protect marine natural heritage, including protection of representative and unique marine life habitats in north central California waters, for their intrinsic value.

1. Include within MPAs the following habitat types: estuaries, heads of submarine canyons, and pinnacles and other habitats identified by the MLPA science advisory team as unique to the north central coast study region. [Comment: the SAT will discuss this at its next meeting.]
2. Include~~Protect~~, and replicate to the extent possible, representatives of all marine habitats identified in the MLPA or the California MLPA Master Plan for Marine Protected Areas-Framework across a range of depths. [Comment: Some NCCRSG members

suggested revising objective 2 to focus on replication only at the scale of the bioregion as required by the MLPA. The SAT guidelines state that in terms of ensuring biological connectivity, allowing for research and monitoring, and protecting against unforeseen disturbances, replication is needed at a scale less than the entire bioregion.]

Goal 5. To ensure that north central California's MPAs have clearly defined objectives, effective management measures, and adequate enforcement, and are based on sound scientific guidelines.

1. Minimize negative socio-economic impacts and optimize positive socio-economic impacts for all users, to the extent possible, and if consistent with the Marine Life Protection Act and its goals and guidelines.
2. For all MPAs in the region involve interested parties to; develop objectives, a long-term monitoring plan that includes standardized biological and socioeconomic monitoring protocols, and a strategy for MPA evaluation, and ensure that each MPA objective is linked to one or more regional objectives.
3. To the extent possible, effectively use scientific guidelines in the California MLPA Master Plan for Marine Protected Areas Framework.

Goal 6. To ensure that the north central coast's MPAs are designed and managed, to the extent possible, as a component of a statewide network.

1. Develop a process to inform adaptive management that includes that includes stakeholder involvement for regional review and evaluation of implementation management effectiveness that includes stakeholder involvement to determine if regional MPAs are an effective component of a statewide network.
2. Develop a mechanism to coordinate with future MLPA regional stakeholder groups in other regions to ensure that the statewide MPA network meets the goals of the MLPA.

[Comment: NCCRSG members suggested adding a new objective to address adaptive management. I-Team staff believe that adaptive management is an overarching premise of the MLPA and is not specifically addressed by a regional objective.]

Design Considerations

~~In developing regional goals and objectives for the central coast, the~~ The NCCRS ~~recognizes identified~~ several issues that should be considered in the design and evaluation of marine protected areas. Like the “Considerations in the Design of MPAs” that appears in the California MLPA Master Plan for Marine Protected Areas Framework, these considerations may apply to all MPAs and MPA proposals regardless of the specific goals and objectives for that MPA. The design considerations below will be incorporated with the provisional goals and objectives and provided to the MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team, MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force, and California Fish and Game Commission. Design considerations with long-term monitoring components will be used in developing monitoring plans and to inform the adaptive management process.

1. In evaluating the siting of MPAs, considerations shall include the needs and interests of all users.
2. Recognize relevant portions of existing state and federal fishery management areas and regulations, to the extent possible, when designing new MPAs or modifying existing ones.
3. To the extent possible, site MPAs to prevent fishing effort shifts that would result in serial depletion.
4. When crafting MPA proposals, include considerations for design found in the Nearshore Fishery Management Plan⁴ and the draft Abalone Recovery and Management Plan.⁵
5. In developing MPA proposals, consider how existing state and federal programs address the goals and objectives of the MLPA and the north central coast region as well as how these proposals may coordinate with other programs.

⁴ Design considerations from Nearshore Fishery Management Plan:

1. Restrict take in any MPA [intended to meet the NFMP goals] so that the directed fishing or significant bycatch of the 19 NFMP species is prohibited.
2. Include some areas that have been productive fishing grounds for the 19 NFMP species in the past but are no longer heavily used by the fishery.
3. Include some areas known to enhance distribution or retain larvae of NFMP species
4. Consist of an area large enough to address biological characteristics such as movement patterns and home range. There is an expectation that some portion of NFMP stocks will spend the majority of their life cycle within the boundaries of the MPA.
5. Consist of areas that replicate various habitat types within each region including areas that exhibit representative productivity.

⁵ Design considerations from ~~draft~~ Abalone Recovery and Management Plan:

Proposed MPA sites should satisfy at least four of the following criteria.

1. Include within MPAs suitable rocky habitat containing abundant kelp and/or foliose algae
2. Insure presence of sufficient populations to facilitate reproduction.
3. Include within MPAs suitable nursery areas, in particular crustose coralline rock habitats in shallow waters that include microhabitats of moveable rock, rock crevices, urchin spine canopy, and kelp holdfasts.
4. Include within MPAs the protected lee of major headlands that may act as collection points for water and larvae.
5. Include MPAs large enough to include large numbers of abalone and for research regarding population dynamics.
6. Include MPAs that are accessible to researchers, enforcement personnel, and others with a legitimate interest in resource protection.

6. To the extent possible, site MPAs adjacent to terrestrial federal, state, county, or city parks, marine laboratories, or other "eyes on the water" to facilitate management, enforcement, and monitoring.
7. To the extent possible, site MPAs to facilitate use of volunteers to assist in monitoring and management.
8. To the extent possible, site MPAs to take advantage of existing long-term monitoring studies.
9. To the extent possible, design MPA boundaries that facilitate ease of public recognition and ease of enforcement.
10. Consider existing public coastal access points when designing MPAs.
11. MPA design should consider the benefits and drawbacks of siting MPAs near to or remote from public access.
12. Consider the potential impacts of climate change, community alteration, and distributional shifts in marine species when designing MPAs.

Implementation Considerations

Implementation considerations arise after the design of MPAs as the California Department of Fish and Game and any other responsible agencies implement decisions of the California Fish and Game Commission and, if appropriate, the California Park and Recreation Commission, with funding from the Legislature or other sources.

1. Improve public outreach related to MPAs through the use of docents, improved signage, and production of an educational brochure for north central coast MPAs.
2. When appropriate, phase the implementation of north central coast MPAs to ensure their effective management, monitoring, and enforcement.
3. Ensure adequate funding for monitoring, management, and enforcement is available for implementing new MPAs.
4. Develop regional management and enforcement measures, including cooperative enforcement agreements, adaptive management, and jurisdictional maps, which can be effectively used, adopted statewide, and periodically reviewed.
5. Incorporate volunteer monitoring and/or cooperative research, where appropriate.

California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative
North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group
PROPOSED AGENDA – MEETING #3
(revised August 23, 2007)

Wednesday, August 22, 2007 at 10:00 a.m.
Thursday, August 23, 2007 at 8:30 a.m.

Four Points by Sheraton *
1010 Northgate Drive
San Rafael, CA 94903

Members of the public are invited to attend the meeting in person or view and listen to the meeting via simultaneous webcasting on the Internet; an archived version will be available approximately two days after the meeting. Please visit the MLPA website at www.dfg.ca.gov/mrd/mlpa/meetings.html for more information.

MEETING OBJECTIVES

- Receive status report on SAT review of regional goals and objectives and discuss implications for adoption
- Continue joint fact-finding and development of draft regional profile
- Receive informational briefings on key topics
- Receive tutorial on marine protected areas decision support tool
- Outline strategy for initiating MPA proposal development
- Initiate process for developing alternative MPA proposals

MEETING AGENDA

Wednesday, August 22, 2007	
9:30 a.m.	<i>Arrival, refreshments and greetings</i>
10:00 a.m.	Welcome, agenda review, and brief introductions
10:15 a.m.	Updates <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Update on NCCRSG membership• Update on regional profile• Report on data collection efforts• Report on status of seafloor mapping data (Handouts A-B)• Update on SAT activities• Summary of concurrent MPA processes (Attachment 1)• California Department of Fish and Game guidance on bag limits, size limits, and catch and release fishing in MPAs (Handout C)
10:45 a.m.	Discuss, revise and adopt north central coast (NCC) regional goals and objectives (Attachment 2, Handout D) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Receive status report on SAT review of regional goals and objectives• Revise document and discuss implications for adoption

** This facility is accessible to persons with disabilities. To request reasonable accommodations for a disability, please contact California Relay Service (at least two days prior to the meeting) at 800.735.2929 (TT) or 800.735.2922 (voice) and ask them to contact the California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative at 916.653.5656.*

Wednesday, August 22, 2007 (continued)	
12:15 p.m.	<i>Lunch (provided on site for NCCRSG members)</i>
1:00 p.m.	Public comment
1:15 p.m.	Presentations on specific features of the NCC study region, and joint fact-finding discussion (Attachment 3, Handouts E-F) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oceanographic features (<i>John Largier, Bodega Marine Lab</i>) • Fish biology, ecology and ecosystem interactions (<i>Steve Ralston, National Marine Fisheries Service</i>)
3:15 p.m.	<i>Break</i>
3:25 p.m.	Plenary discussion – interest sharing to inform MPA planning
5:45 p.m.	<i>Adjourn</i>
6:30 p.m.	<i>NCCRSG dinner for primary and alternate members</i>

Thursday, August 23, 2007	
8:30 a.m.	Review agenda for Day 2
8:40 a.m.	Continued - Presentations on specific features of NCC study region, and discussion (Handout G) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreational fishing (<i>Jason Vasquez, California Department of Fish and Game</i>)
9:15 a.m.	Science guidelines and MPA connectivity (<i>Steve Gaines, MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team, 2005-2007</i>) (Handout H)
9:45 a.m.	Overview of MLPA Central Coast Study Region MPAs (Handout I)
10:00 a.m.	<i>Break</i>
10:15 a.m.	Review of decision support tools; introduction to DORIS (Handouts J-K)
11:30 a.m.	Present strategy for initiating MPA proposal development (Handouts L-M)
12:00 p.m.	<i>Lunch (provided on site for NCCRSG members)</i>
12:45 p.m.	Public comment
1:00 p.m.	Breakout session activity to identify areas of importance (Handout N)
3:15p.m.	Next steps and preparations for next NCCRSG meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review work session/support opportunities before next meeting (Handout O) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Initial MPA development – Revision of regional profile • Review objectives for meeting #4
3:45 p.m.	<i>Adjourn</i>

Attachments

1. *Summary of Recent and Ongoing Processes Related to Marine Protected Areas in California* (August 14, 2007)
2. Draft provisional regional goals and objectives (revised August 10, 2007)
3. MLPA North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group meeting 2 (July 10, 2007) joint fact-finding notes

Handouts

- A. PowerPoint presentation: Update on seafloor mapping data (*Paulo Serpa, California Department of Fish and Game*)
- B. Revised map 3 of draft regional profile (preliminary substrate data)
- C. California Department of Fish and Game memorandum regarding bag limits, size limits, and catch and release fishing in MPAs
- D. PowerPoint presentation: Draft Provisional North Central Coast Regional Goals and Objectives (*Jason Vasquez, California Department of Fish and Game*)
- E. PowerPoint presentation: Oceanographic Features (*John Largier, Bodega Marine Lab*)
- F. PowerPoint presentation: Fish biology, ecology and ecosystem interactions (*Steve Ralston, National Marine Fisheries Service*)
- G. PowerPoint presentation: Recreational fishing (*Jason Vasquez, California Department of Fish and Game*)
- H. Science guidelines and MPA connectivity (*Steve Gaines, MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team, 2005-2007*)
- I. PowerPoint presentation: Overview of MLPA Central Coast Study Region MPAs (*John Ugoretz, California Department of Fish and Game*)
- J. PowerPoint presentation: MPA decision support tools (*Mary Gleason, California MLPA Initiative*)
- K. DORIS: Marine Protected Areas Decision Support Tool User's Manual
- L. PowerPoint presentation: Development of MPA proposals (*Melissa Miller-Henson, California MLPA Initiative*)
- M. Template for draft MPA proposals
- N. Breakout session activity to identify areas of importance
- O. Work group guidance for initial MPA proposal recommendations
- P. List of MLPA staff and roles in the MLPA Initiative

Key Outcomes Memorandum

Date: August 31, 2007

To: Members, MLPA North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group

From: Scott McCreary and Eric Poncelet, CONCUR, Inc.

Re: Key Outcomes Memorandum – August 22-23, 2007 Meeting

cc: MLPA Initiative Staff and California Department of Fish and Game MLPA Staff

Executive Summary – Key Outcomes

On August 22-23, 2007, the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) Initiative North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (NCCRSG) participated in its third meeting, in San Rafael, CA. **Key outcomes** from the meeting are as follows:

- NCCRSG considered initial MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT) guidance and revised the provisional regional goals and objectives. NCCRSG forwarded one final question for SAT consideration. NCCRSG will consider the SAT response and discuss final adoption of the provisional regional goals and objectives at its October 16-17, 2007 meeting.
- NCCRSG initiated the process of developing initial MPA recommendations. This process will build on three work groups composed of a balanced cross section of NCCRSG members. Interim work group sessions are scheduled for September 7 and 25, 2007.
- NCCRSG received informational briefings and participated in ongoing joint fact-finding. Key topics discussed included: oceanographic features, fish biology and ecology, recreational fisheries, and SAT size and spacing guidelines.
- I-Team staff reviewed the process by which science questions would be framed and reviewed by the SAT. The NCCRSG identified additional science questions for SAT consideration.
- NCCRSG received an update on revisions to the draft regional profile and reviewed next steps to revise the document. The I-Team will convene an NCCRSG regional profile work group in September to review the revisions made.
- NCCRSG received an overview of DORIS, the MPA decision support tool, and participated in hands-on demonstrations of the tool.
- The I-Team staff announced the appointment of two additional alternates to the NCCRSG: Nick Tipon (Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria) and Hedley Prince (Port of San Francisco).

Key **next steps** include:

- Prepare for and convene work group (emerald, jade, and turquoise work groups) sessions on September 7 and 25, 2007 (San Rafael, Four Points Sheraton)
- Prepare for and convene a regional profile work group meeting in September (date TBD)

I. Meeting Participants and Materials

Twenty-three NCCRSR primary members and fourteen alternate members participated in the August 22-23, 2007 meeting.

MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team members participating in the meeting included: Sarah Allen, Steve Gaines, Caroline Hermans, Steve Morgan, and Karina Nielsen. Meg Caldwell participated on behalf of the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF).

MLPA Initiative and California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) staff—collectively known as the “I-Team”—staffed the meeting. NCCRSR members were provided with brief descriptions of I-Team staff roles. An updated version of this document appears as Attachment 1.

Meeting materials, including copies of the PowerPoint presentations, may be found on the MLPA website at: http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mrd/mlpa/meeting_082207.html

II. Key Outcomes

A. NCCRSR received provisional SAT guidance and revised the north central coast regional goals and objectives

1. I-Team presentation of provisional SAT guidance

I-Team staff presented provisional SAT responses to questions on the draft regional goals and objectives identified at the July 10-11, 2007 NCCRSR meeting. This guidance was prepared by SAT sub-teams that were initiated at the August 16, 2007 SAT meeting. The guidance was considered “provisional” as it had not yet been reviewed and adopted by the full SAT.

I-Team staff clarified that while NCCRSR members are encouraged to take SAT guidance into account, the NCCRSR does not require formal SAT approval to come to agreement on north central coast regional goals and objectives.

2. NCCRSR agreement on key revisions

NCCRSR members, with input from an informal NCCRSR work group that met over lunch on day 1, came to unanimous agreement on revisions to the document. The revised provisional regional goals and objectives are attached as Attachment 2. Key changes included:

- Revised the text in several objectives to increase measurability, drawing on recommendations from the SAT sub-teams.
- Moved goal 1, objective 2 to the design considerations section.
- Split goal 2, objective 2 into two separate objectives to add clarity.
- Revised goal 3, objective 1 to make it applicable to both consumptive and non-consumptive recreational uses.
- Added key indicators to goal 3, objective 2 to enhance the objective’s measurability.
- Identified “unique” habitats for the north central coast study region in goal 4, objective 1, drawing on a SAT sub-team recommendation.

- Added a new design consideration stating: “To the extent possible, preserve the diversity of recreational, educational, commercial, and cultural uses.”

3. One remaining question for SAT consideration

NCCRSG members agreed to forward one additional question to the SAT for guidance on the provisional regional goals and objectives:

- Goal 4, objective 1: NCCRSG members seek guidance as to whether the deep-water benthic and water column habitats are also deemed “unique” and therefore worthy of inclusion in this objective.

The SAT will consider this question during its September 17, 2007 teleconference.

4. Next steps to adoption at October 16-17, 2007 NCCRSG meeting

NCCRSG members agreed to consider the document for adoption at their October 16-17, 2007 meeting. The focus of these deliberations will be on the one remaining question where SAT guidance has been requested. The NCCRSG will not reconsider the goals and objectives agreed upon at its August 22-23, 2007 meeting.

B. NCCRSG initiated the process of developing initial MPA recommendations

1. Sharing of NCCRSG interests

As a strategy to build broader understanding of the range of interests represented in the NCCRSG, each member was given the opportunity during a plenary session to share “what is important to them” in the study region. Some NCCRSG members described the origins of their interest in the initiative. Others described the particular resources or resource uses of greatest concern. Still others described their core interests in the study region. Key recurring themes among the interests expressed included the following:

- Interest in the creation of good public policy and the use of good science and information.
- Interest in adequate public access for multiple uses.
- Interest in sustaining marine resources and cultural/community heritage for future generations.
- Interest in finding mutual gains and win-win solutions.

A summary of the stakeholder interests shared is attached as Attachment 3. This information will also be used to inform development of initial MPA recommendations (see description of work group activities below).

2. Description of work group process

I-Team staff outlined the process toward developing initial MPA proposals over the next two months. A handout describing this process, including group composition, is attached as Attachment 4. Key elements of the process include:

- This approach builds on the Day 1 interest sharing activity.

- NCCRS members will be organized into three multistakeholder work groups (titled the “emerald,” “jade,” and “turquoise” work groups). These work groups were characterized by a balance across interests and expertise. Work group composition will be assigned by the I-Team. This approach is based on several lessons learned from the central coast process. In particular, this approach helps ensure cross-interest dialogue and full participation in the initial phases of MPA proposal development. It also helps generate a range of options.
- The I-Team recognizes that other groups (single or multiple-interest) may also be developing MPA proposals simultaneously. NCCRS members are welcome to bring these ideas into the work group process. Cross work group collaboration is also encouraged.
- Work groups will meet at least twice between the August and October NCCRS meetings to help initiate the development of initial MPA recommendations. In-person work sessions are currently scheduled for September 7 and 25, 2007. These sessions will be supported by I-Team staff.
- Initial MPA recommendations will be due to the I-Team by October 1, 2007. Initial MPA recommendations are to be as complete as possible.
- Work groups will present their initial recommendations to the full NCCRS at the October 16-17, 2007 meeting. Work groups will revise their recommendations based on NCCRS comments and other information presented and resubmit them to the I-Team by the end of the October 16-17, 2007 NCCRS meeting. The work groups should also identify any areas of disagreement. I-Team staff will then forward the revised initial MPA “proposals” to the SAT and BRTF for review and evaluation.
- MPA proposal development is to be informed by the best readily available information.
- At the October 16-17 NCCRS meeting, the NCCRS will reassess how to move forward with MPA proposal development. This may include continuing with the work groups or forming new work groups.

NCCRS members asked clarifying questions about the work group approach. Several NCCRS members expressed a strong desire to arrive at a single or preferred MPA proposal. I-Team staff expressed support for this objective and assured NCCRS members that the near-term work group approach is consistent with this aim.

3. Identification of key “areas of importance”

NCCRS members participated in a breakout session activity, organized by the work groups identified above. Each work group member was given the opportunity to identify on maps two or three core areas of interest within the study region. Work group members were also asked to indicate whether those areas of importance pertained to interests of: 1) habitat representation, ecosystem protection, and sustaining marine life populations; 2) consumptive recreational and commercial activities; 3) non-consumptive recreational and commercial activities; and/or 4) educational and study opportunities.

I-Team staff captured these core areas of importance in both text and GIS format. The results of all three work group discussions will be used to inform the work group sessions on September 7 and 25.

4. Work group next steps

I-Team staff will establish list-serves for each of the three work groups to facilitate intra-group communications. Members of specific work groups are also invited to use the list-serves to communicate and coordinate with other groups.

I-Team staff will send details for the September 7, 2007 work group sessions several days in advance. The sessions will all take place from 10:00 AM – 3:00 PM in San Rafael at the Four Points Sheraton.

C. NCCRSR received informational briefings and participated in ongoing joint fact-finding

NCCRSR members received several informational presentations intended to inform the MPA planning process.

1. Presentations on specific features of the MLPA North Central Coast Study Region

SAT members and I-Team staff provided informational briefings on several key topics:

- 1) Oceanographic features (John Largier, Bodega Marine Lab).
- 2) Fish biology, ecology and ecosystem interactions (Steve Ralston, National Marine Fisheries Service)
- 3) Recreational fisheries (Jason Vasques, DFG, with input from several NCCRSR members)

Following each presentation, presenters and NCCRSR members offered additional detail or made clarifying comments. Key comments included the following:

- John Largier walked through the sub-regions identifying key areas of importance. I-Team staff will add this information to the sub-regional summaries section of the regional profile.
- NCCRSR members noted that it is especially helpful to know the longitudinal ranges where particular species are found.
- NCCRSR recreational fishing representatives reiterated the importance of safe access to salmon fishing, in particular, to the recreational fishery in the north central coast study region.

2. Presentation on science guidelines and MPA connectivity

SAT member Steve Gaines presented on the science guidelines in the master plan for MPAs to be used in evaluating MPA proposals. NCCRSR members asked a number of clarifying questions. Some of these were identified as questions meriting consideration by the full SAT (see section II.D below). Other key comments and clarifications included the following:

- The SAT's size and spacing guidelines apply to the MLPA goals addressing ecosystem protection.
- The NCCRSR may elect to propose MPAs smaller than the "minimum" recommended size or spaced farther away than the "maximum" recommended

spacing for the purpose of achieving other (i.e., non-ecosystem protection) goals in the MLPA.

- The NCCRSG will have to make choices regarding size and spacing of MPAs. These will be driven by tradeoffs regarding the benefits to different species.
- Other existing regulations (e.g., Rockfish Conservation Area) provide some protection in areas outside of MPAs. This should be considered in the MPA development process.
- The characterization of “levels of protection” for specific MPAs proposed for the central coast process was based on the specific regulations proposed for those areas. It is not “deterministic” for the north central coast study region.
- It would be helpful if the SAT could provide additional information regarding “levels of protection”—in particular, to answer the question: “If you allow x take (of particular species), what level of protection will be provided?”
- In the central coast process, Tom Barnes with DFG’s groundfish staff provided input on total allowable catch (TAC) adjustment in response to MPAs. Based on early analysis, he felt TACs would not need to be adjusted in response to MPAs because existing management already included precautions that would absorb MPAs up to at least 20% of available habitat for any given stock. Note: DFG staff will produce a policy memo that will address this and other TAC issues more specifically. They intend to provide the memo to the SAT at its November meeting and distribute a final memo to the NCCRSG at its December 11-12, 2007 meeting.

3. Guidance on bag limits, size limits, and catch and release fishing in MPAs

I-Team staff presented DFG guidance on bag limits, size limits, and catch and release fishing in MPAs. NCCRSG members posed the following clarifying comments:

- Confirm whether catch and release could work for shore fishermen.
- The issues raised are complex. NCCRSG members suggested that the DFG memorandum be considered part of an ongoing dialogue on this subject.

4. Presentation on central coast study region adopted MPAs

I-Team staff provided an overview of the adopted central coast MPAs and highlighted how SAT size and spacing guidelines were applied for this region.

D. NCCRSG identified additional science questions for SAT consideration

1. SAT process for responding to NCCRSG questions

NCCRSG members and I-Team staff discussed the process by which the SAT will respond to science questions raised by the NCCRSG. Key steps in the process include:

- a. Members of the Science Sub-Team to the MLPA North Central Coast Project will attend all NCCRSG meetings and will be responsible, along with I-Team staff, for clarifying and recording questions generated during the meeting. NCCRSG members will confirm the framing of science questions prior to the conclusion of each NCCRSG meeting.

- b. The list of questions recorded on flip charts will be reviewed by the MLPA staff and the SAT co-chairs to determine their appropriateness for the SAT review. Some may more appropriately be directed to MLPA staff, DFG legal counsel, or other groups.
- c. SAT support staff may conduct background research and draft responses to some questions. Questions and draft responses will be disseminated to the SAT prior to the next SAT meeting.
- d. Draft responses to the questions will be discussed at the next SAT meeting. Depending on the timing of the next in-person SAT meeting, a conference call meeting may be organized to discuss questions and finalize responses. Staff will record SAT support for the responses.
- e. SAT responses will be conveyed to the NCCRSG.

2. Additional science questions identified for SAT consideration

I-Team staff reviewed the questions identified at previous NCCRSG meetings that are currently under consideration by the SAT. At the August 22-23, 2007 meeting, NCCRSG members identified the following additional questions for SAT consideration:

- 1) Finish consideration of the provisional DRAFT Goals and Objectives and develop responses to outstanding questions.
- 2) Are the deep-water benthic habitats and water column habitat around the Farallon Islands unique and therefore worthy of inclusion in goal 4, objective 1?
- 3) Specifically – where do subtidal waters or the subtidal zone start? Do they only span to the extent of state waters or do they extend to XX depth (and if so, what depth)?
- 4) What level of protection would you assign to MPAs that allow take of: salmon, abalone, urchin, clams (*halibut*, *white seabass*, *crab*)?
- 5) What is the range and pattern of movement for the various life-stages of yellow-eye rockfish, surfperch, greenling, cabezon, monkeyfaced pricklyback, halibut, and white seabass?
- 6) The recommendation to extend MPAs to the 3-mile state waters limit to cover the range of depths and species that utilize the range of depths was appropriate for the central coast study region. The north central coast study region is largely homogenous out to the 3-mile limit. Is it still appropriate that MPAs extend to the 3-mile state boundary for the north central coast study region?
- 7) List of species – Will a presentation on the “list of species likely to benefit from MPAs” be made to the RSG? Or, will a handout suffice?
- 8) How will the SAT evaluate proposals relative to goal 2, objective 2 for the protection of foraging, nursery and rearing areas? Specifically, how will seabirds, mammals, and sharks be considered?
- 9) Estimate the number of pinnipeds in the area and estimate the corresponding weight of fish taken.
- 10) Is it possible to disaggregate the 10-100 km category for home ranges into a finer set? More specifically, if we apply a set of intermediate size categories, how many species might be protected.

Note: Following the NCCRSG meeting, individual NCCRSG members requested that additional science questions be passed on to the SAT. These include:

- 11) The SAT guidelines suggest that marine assemblages may differ depending on the substrate type, even within the broad 'hard bottom' category. Specifically, they suggest there may be differences in assemblages in and over granitic and sedimentary substrate on the Central Coast. In this regard:
 - a) Does the same hold true for granitic, sedimentary, and Franciscan substrate on the north central coast?
 - b) If so, does the SAT know of some way to predict where these substrates occur given the Kvitek data or otherwise?
- 12) Can the SAT provide more information on what the composition of the assemblages is likely to be in and over these different substrate types? (so we know what we're trying to protect, if necessary)

E. NCCRSR received update on revisions to draft regional profile, and next steps

I-Team staff reported that revisions to the draft regional profile are nearing completion.

During the meeting, NCCRSR members also offered additional comments on the draft regional profile. Key comments included:

- NCCRSR members noted that map #7 in the regional profile shows catch data but has been labeled as “hot spots” in the table of contents. The I-Team agreed to make the revision in the next iteration of the document.
- More generally, NCCRSR members requested that the maps in the regional profile include appropriate metadata and definition of key terms so the information content of each map is clear.

The I-Team will convene an NCCRSR work group meeting to review the revisions to the profile. This meeting will take place in September. Work group volunteers include: Ed Tavasieff, Paul Pierce, Bill Bernard, Karen Reyna (or Irina Kogan), Bob Breen, Samantha Murray, Santi Roberts, and Fred Smith. The I-Team will provide a track changes version of the regional profile.

I-Team staff intends to have the next round of revisions completed by the October 16-17, 2007 NCCRSR meeting.

F. NCCRSR received an overview of DORIS (MPA decision support tool)

I-Team staff presented an overview of DORIS, a key decision support tool to assist NCCRSR members in MPA planning. NCCRSR members participated in detailed hands-on demonstrations of the tool. I-Team staff reminded NCCRSR members that the naming convention for proposed MPAs is described on page 14 of the DORIS User's Manual.

G. Update on NCCRSR membership

I-Team staff announced that two additional alternates had been appointed to the NCCRSR: Nick Tipon (representative of the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria; alternate for Nelson Pinola), and Hedley Prince (representative of the Port of San Francisco; alternate for Peter Grenell). With these additions, membership of the NCCRSR is considered to be complete. An updated NCCRSR roster is attached as Attachment 5.

H. Public comment

The meeting included designated public comment periods on both day 1 and day 2. Several members of the public provided comments. Key comments included:

- The NCCRSR needs to be mindful of people with disabilities when considering issues of public access in designing MPAs.
- It is important to have buy-in from fishermen in the development of MPAs.
- Additional information on sharks needs to be incorporated into the regional profile.
- NCCRSR member Francesca Koe invited members of the NCCRSR to two events during the weekend of August 25-26, 2007.

I. Upcoming Tour Invitations

Jay Yokomizo and Tom Mattusch invited NCCRSR members on a boat tour of the Farallon Islands and other areas of the north central coast study region. The tour will also include some recreational fishing. The tour is scheduled for October 3, 2007 (all day). I-Team staff will assist by sending email invitations to the full NCCRSR.

J. Objectives for NCCRSR Meeting #2

The next NCCRSR meeting is scheduled for October 16-17, 2007 in Gualala, CA. Key objectives for the meeting are to:

- Consider additional SAT feedback and adopt provisional regional goals and objectives
- Building on interim work group activities, continue and complete development of initial suite of MPA proposals for review by the SAT and BRTF
- Receive SAT responses to science questions
- Continue joint fact-finding and development of the regional profile
- Present informational briefings (potential topics include: water quality, preliminary results of socioeconomic analyses)

III. Recap of Next Steps

A. Key next steps for NCCRSR members

1. Participate in work group activities to develop initial MPA recommendations. Work group sessions are scheduled for September 7 and 25, 2007. The meetings will take place in San Rafael at the Four Points Sheraton.
2. Regional profile work group (volunteers include Ed Tavasieff, Paul Pierce, Bill Bernard, Karen Reyna (or Irina Kogan), Bob Breen, Samantha Murray, Santi Roberts, and Fred Smith) to meet in September (date to be determined) to review revisions to draft regional profile.

B. Key next steps for I-Team staff

1. Prepare for interim work group activities:
 - I-Team will establish list-serves for each of the three work groups (note: this task is complete)

- Prepare for September 7 and 25, 2007 work group meetings; send meeting materials (e.g., agenda, summary of NCCRSG member core interests, summary of stated “areas of importance”, other guidance documents) to work group members in advance of the meetings.
- 2. Complete and distribute revised draft regional profile. Schedule regional profile work group meeting to review revisions to the draft regional profile.
- 3. Assist Jay Yokomizo and Tom Mattusch in planning a recreational fishing tour of the study region on October 3, 2007. Send email invitations to full NCCRSG and request RSVPs.
- 4. Prepare a policy memo that will address potential TAC issues. Provide the memo to the SAT at its November meeting and distribute a final memo to the NCCRSG at its December 11-12, 2007 meeting.

Attachments Referenced

1. List of I-Team staff and their roles in the MLPA Initiative
2. Provisional North Central Coast Regional Goals and Objectives, revised August 22, 2007 based on NCCRSG discussions at August 22-23, 2007 meeting. (Note: This version of the document identifies one question to be forwarded to the MLPA SAT for consideration during the SAT’s September 17, 2007 meeting).
3. NCCRSG stakeholder identified interests in the North Central Coast Study Region
4. Work group guidance for initial MPA proposal recommendations
5. Updated NCCRSG roster

California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative
List of MLPA Staff and their Roles in the MLPA Initiative
August 31, 2007

Brian Naslund – Captain: Enforcement coordinator for MLPA and marine issues. Provides direct input to stakeholder group and staff on enforcement concerns. [DFG]

Bryan Crouch – Biologist: Provides process and data support. [DFG]

Chamois Anderson – Media Relations: Assists DFG and the MLPA Initiative with media relations and communications. Develops media strategies and written materials for distribution. [MLPA Initiative]

Delbra Gibbs – Logistics Coordinator: Provides logistical support for all MLPA Initiative meetings by organizing meeting locations, materials, meals, etc. [MLPA Initiative]

Dennis Michniuk – Environmental Scientist: Provides process and data support, including GIS and scientific technical support. [DFG]

Elizabeth Pope-Smith – Biologist: Outreach and information specialist. Prepares materials for public and stakeholder group use. [DFG]

Eric Poncelet – Facilitator: Co-facilitates both regional stakeholder group and statewide interests group meetings, provides strategic planning and process design support, and helps to prepare meeting materials [MLPA Initiative].

Evan Fox – I-Team Coordinator and Assistant Planner. Coordinates activities of the MLPA Initiative team and provides data summary and analysis support. [MLPA Initiative]

Jared Kibele – GIS Data Specialist (Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission): Provides technical and analytical support for geospatial data sets and processes. [DFG]

Jason Vasques – Associate Biologist: Science and monitoring oversight. Provides technical advice and assistance to Science Advisory Team process and stakeholder group [DFG]

John Ugoretz – Marine Habitat Conservation Program Manager: DFG coordinator and policy advisor for all marine protected area issues. Provides overall DFG support for MLPA and DFG representative to the MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team. [DFG]

Kathie Magnuson – Office Assistant: Provides administrative support for MLPA Initiative activities. [MLPA Initiative]

Ken Wiseman – Executive Director: Oversees the MLPA Initiative process, directs and manages staff, and reports to the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force. [MLPA Initiative]

Mary Gleason – Principal Planner: Provides data and scientific oversight and support. Provides primary support to the MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team and oversight of all geo-spatial (GIS) products. [MLPA Initiative]

Matt Merrifield – GIS Analyst: Provides GIS support for analysis and data development, and systems and database administration for decision support tools. [MLPA Initiative]

Melissa Miller-Henson – Program Manager: DFG employee on assignment to the MLPA Initiative. Provides project management, planning and communications oversight for the MLPA Initiative. [MLPA Initiative]

Nicole Douglas – Assistant Marine Planner: Provides planning support to the regional stakeholder group and science advisory team. Assists with data summary and analysis. [MLPA Initiative]

Paulo Serpa – Research Analyst II: GIS oversight, coordination and support. Provides technical and analytical support for geospatial data sets and processes. [DFG]

Rebecca Studebaker – Biologist: Provides support in developing outreach, scientific and other materials. [DFG]

Scott McCreary – Facilitator: Co-facilitates both regional stakeholder group and statewide interest group meetings, provides strategic planning and process design support, and helps to prepare meeting materials. [MLPA Initiative]

Steve Martarano – Supervising Information Officer: Manages MLPA media relations, disseminates information to the media, responds to inquiries. [DFG]

Susan Ashcraft – Senior Biologist Supervisor: Regional coordinator for north central coast process and MPA project supervisor. Primary DFG seat on regional stakeholder group planning process. [DFG]

Will McClintock – Database Manager: Maintains GIS information stored in the MLPA geodatabase and provides support in the creation of data management and decision support tools. [MLPA Initiative]

California MLPA North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group
Revised Provisional Regional Goals and Objectives for
Review and Adoption by the NCCRSB at its October, 2007 Meeting
Revised August 22, 2007

The text below reflects revisions made at the NCCRSB's August 22, 2007 meeting. At the meeting, the NCCRSB unanimously agreed to use these goals and objectives as provisionally adopted and forward a final question to the SAT.

Introduction

The members of the North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (NCCRSB) agree that regional goals, objectives, and design and implementation considerations are all very important in the development of an effective system of marine protected areas (MPAs) that have stakeholder support. Regional goals are statements of what the regional MPAs are ultimately trying to achieve (Pomeroy et al. 2004)¹. The regional goals are largely taken directly from the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) itself. Regional objectives are more specific measurable statements of what MPAs may accomplish to attain a related goal (Pomeroy et al. 2004). The NCCRSB recognizes that MPAs are one among a suite of tools to manage marine resources.

Design considerations are additional factors that may help fulfill provisions of the MLPA related to facilitating enforcement, encouraging public involvement, and incorporating socio-economic considerations, while meeting the act's goals and guidelines. Design considerations will be applied as the location, category (reserve, park or conservation area), size and other characteristics of potential MPAs are being developed. Design considerations are cross cutting (they apply to all MPAs) and are not necessarily measurable. MPA alternatives developed by the NCCRSB should include analysis of how the proposal addresses both regional goals and objectives and design guidelines.²

¹ Pomeroy R.S., J.E. Parks, and L.M. Watson. 2004. How is your MPA doing? A Guidebook of Natural and Social Indicators for Evaluating Marine Protected Area Management Effectiveness. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK. xvi + 216 p. (Accessed 17 January 2004).
<http://effectivempa.noaa.gov/guidebook/guidebook.html>.

² John Kirlin Memo, August 22, 2005.

Provisional Regional Objectives

Goal 1. To protect the natural diversity and abundance³ of marine life, and the structure, function, and integrity of marine ecosystems.

1. Protect species diversity and abundance consistent with natural fluctuations by including and maintaining areas of high native species diversity and representative habitats. ~~Protect/Include areas of high species diversity and maintain species diversity and abundance, consistent with natural fluctuations, of populations in representative habitats.~~ [Question for SAT: does the SAT have comments on the respective measurability of these alternate terms (objectives 1 and 2)?]
2. ~~Protect/Include areas with diverse habitat types in close proximity to each other.~~ [Propose moving to a design guideline as this is about efficiency of design not adaptive management]
3. Protect natural size and age structure and genetic diversity of populations in representative habitats.
4. Protect natural trophic structure and food webs in representative habitats.
5. Protect ecosystem structure, function, integrity and ecological processes to facilitate recovery of natural communities from disturbances both natural and human induced.

Goal 2. To help sustain, conserve, and protect marine life populations, including those of economic value, and rebuild those that are depleted.

1. Help protect ~~and/~~ or rebuild populations of rare, threatened, endangered, depressed, depleted, or overfished species, where identified, and the habitats and ecosystem functions upon which they rely.⁴
2. Sustain or increase ~~reproductive capacity~~ reproduction by ~~of~~ species most likely to benefit from MPAs through retention of large, mature individuals⁵; ~~protection of larval source areas, and/or~~

³ *Natural diversity* is the species richness of a community or area when protected from, or not subjected to, human-induced change (drawn from Allaby 1998 and Kelleher 1992). *Natural abundance* is the total number of individuals in a population protected from, or not subjected to, human-induced change (adapted from Department 2004 and Kelleher 1992).

⁴ The terms "rare," "threatened," "endangered," "depressed," "depleted," and "overfished" referenced here are designations in state and federal legislation, regulations, and fishery management plans (FMPs)—e.g., California Fish and Game Code, Marine Mammal Protection Act, Magnuson Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), California Nearshore FMP, Federal Groundfish FMP). *Rare*, *endangered*, and *threatened* are designations under the California Endangered Species Act. *Depleted* is a designation under the federal Marine Mammal Protection Act. *Depressed* means the condition of a marine fishery that exhibits declining fish population abundance levels below those consistent with maximum sustainable yield (California Fish and Game Code, Section 90.7). *Overfished* means a population that does not produce maximum sustainable yield on a continuing basis (MSA) and in the California Nearshore FMP and federal Groundfish FMP also means a population that falls below the threshold of 30% or 25%, successively, of the estimated unfished biomass

3. Sustain or increase reproduction by species most likely to benefit from MPAs through protection of breeding, foraging, rearing or nursery areas.

- 3.4. Protect selected species and the habitats on which they depend while allowing the commercial and/or recreational harvest of migratory, highly mobile, or other species where appropriate through the use of state marine conservation areas and state marine parks.

Goal 3. To improve recreational, educational, and study opportunities provided by marine ecosystems that are subject to minimal human disturbances, and to manage these uses in a manner consistent with protecting biodiversity.

1. Ensure some MPAs are close to population centers, coastal access points, and/or research and education institutions and include areas of educational, ~~and non-consumptive~~ recreational, and cultural use.
2. ~~Protect Sustain~~ or enhance cultural, ~~and~~ recreational, ~~and educational~~ experiences, ~~including collecting and recreational fishing,~~ by ... ~~[Comment: Science team, craft something measurable—including minimal human disturbances]~~ improving catch rates, high scenic value, lower congestion, or increased size or abundance of species.
3. To enhance the likelihood of scientifically valid studies, replicate appropriate MPA designations, habitats or control areas (including areas open to fishing) to the extent possible.
4. Develop collaborative scientific monitoring and research projects evaluating MPAs that link with fisheries management information needs, classroom science curricula, volunteer dive programs, and fishermen, and identify participants.

Goal 4. To protect marine natural heritage, including protection of representative and unique marine life habitats in north central California waters, for their intrinsic value.

1. Include within MPAs the following habitat types: estuaries and ~~other habitats identified by the MLPA science advisory team as unique to the north central coast study region. [Comment: the SAT will discuss this at its next meeting.]~~ the intertidal and subtidal waters around the Farallon Islands. [are the deep water benthic and water column habitats unique as well and worthy of inclusion?]
2. Include, and replicate to the extent possible [practicable], representatives of all marine habitats identified in the MLPA or the *California MLPA Master Plan for Marine Protected Areas* across a range of depths.

⁵ An increase in lifetime egg production will be an important quantitative measure of an improvement of reproduction.

Goal 5. To ensure that north central California's MPAs have clearly defined objectives, effective management measures, and adequate enforcement, and are based on sound scientific guidelines.

1. Minimize negative socio-economic impacts and optimize positive socio-economic impacts for all users, to the extent possible, and if consistent with the Marine Life Protection Act and its goals and guidelines.
2. For all MPAs in the region involve interested parties to [help](#); develop objectives, a long-term monitoring plan that includes standardized biological and socioeconomic monitoring protocols, and a strategy for MPA evaluation, and ensure that each MPA objective is linked to one or more regional objectives.
3. To the extent possible, effectively use scientific guidelines in the *California MLPA Master Plan for Marine Protected Areas*.

Goal 6. To ensure that the north central coast's MPAs are designed and managed, to the extent possible, as a component of a statewide network.

1. Develop a process to inform adaptive management that includes stakeholder involvement for regional review and evaluation of management effectiveness to determine if regional MPAs are an effective component of a statewide network.
2. Develop a mechanism to coordinate with future MLPA regional stakeholder groups in other regions to ensure that the statewide MPA network meets the goals of the MLPA.

Design Considerations

The NCCRSB recognizes several issues that should be considered in the design and evaluation of marine protected areas. Like the “Considerations in the Design of MPAs” that appears in the *California MLPA Master Plan for Marine Protected Areas*, these considerations may apply to all MPAs and MPA proposals regardless of the specific goals and objectives for that MPA. The design considerations below will be incorporated with the provisional goals and objectives and provided to the MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team, MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force, and California Fish and Game Commission. Design considerations with long-term monitoring components will be used in developing monitoring plans and to inform the adaptive management process.

1. In evaluating the siting of MPAs, considerations shall include the needs and interests of all users.
2. Recognize relevant portions of existing state and federal fishery management areas and regulations, to the extent possible, when designing new MPAs or modifying existing ones.
3. To the extent possible, site MPAs to prevent fishing effort shifts that would result in serial depletion.
4. When crafting MPA proposals, include considerations for design found in the Nearshore Fishery Management Plan⁶ and the draft Abalone Recovery and Management Plan.⁷
5. In developing MPA proposals, consider how existing state and federal programs address the goals and objectives of the MLPA and the north central coast region as well as how these proposals may coordinate with other programs.

⁶ Design considerations from Nearshore Fishery Management Plan:

1. Restrict take in any MPA [intended to meet the NFMP goals] so that the directed fishing or significant bycatch of the 19 NFMP species is prohibited.
2. Include some areas that have been productive fishing grounds for the 19 NFMP species in the past but are no longer heavily used by the fishery.
3. Include some areas known to enhance distribution or retain larvae of NFMP species
4. Consist of an area large enough to address biological characteristics such as movement patterns and home range. There is an expectation that some portion of NFMP stocks will spend the majority of their life cycle within the boundaries of the MPA.
5. Consist of areas that replicate various habitat types within each region including areas that exhibit representative productivity.

⁷ Design considerations from Abalone Recovery and Management Plan:

Proposed MPA sites should satisfy at least four of the following criteria.

1. Include within MPAs suitable rocky habitat containing abundant kelp and/or foliose algae
2. Insure presence of sufficient populations to facilitate reproduction.
3. Include within MPAs suitable nursery areas, in particular crustose coralline rock habitats in shallow waters that include microhabitats of moveable rock, rock crevices, urchin spine canopy, and kelp holdfasts.
4. Include within MPAs the protected lee of major headlands that may act as collection points for water and larvae.
5. Include MPAs large enough to include large numbers of abalone and for research regarding population dynamics.
6. Include MPAs that are accessible to researchers, enforcement personnel, and others with a legitimate interest in resource protection.

6. To the extent possible, site MPAs adjacent to terrestrial federal, state, county, or city parks, marine laboratories, or other "eyes on the water" to facilitate management, enforcement, and monitoring.
7. To the extent possible, site MPAs to facilitate use of volunteers to assist in monitoring and management.
8. To the extent possible, site MPAs to take advantage of existing long-term monitoring studies.
9. To the extent possible, design MPA boundaries that facilitate ease of public recognition and ease of enforcement.
10. Consider existing public coastal access points when designing MPAs.
11. MPA design should consider the benefits and drawbacks of siting MPAs near to or remote from public access.
12. Consider the potential impacts of climate change, community alteration, and distributional shifts in marine species when designing MPAs.
13. To the extent possible, preserve the diversity of recreational, educational, commercial, and cultural uses.

Implementation Considerations

Implementation considerations arise after the design of MPAs as the California Department of Fish and Game and any other responsible agencies implement decisions of the California Fish and Game Commission and, if appropriate, the California Park and Recreation Commission, with funding from the Legislature or other sources.

1. Improve public outreach related to MPAs through the use of docents, improved signage, and production of an educational brochure for north central coast MPAs.
2. When appropriate, phase the implementation of north central coast MPAs to ensure their effective management, monitoring, and enforcement.
3. Ensure adequate funding for monitoring, management, and enforcement is available for implementing new MPAs.
4. Develop regional management and enforcement measures, including cooperative enforcement agreements, adaptive management, and jurisdictional maps, which can be effectively used, adopted statewide, and periodically reviewed.
5. Incorporate volunteer monitoring and/or cooperative research, where appropriate.

California MLPA North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group

Stakeholder Identified Interests in the North Central Coast Study Region

Revised August 30, 2007

During the first day of the August 22-23, 2007 meeting of the MLPA North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (NCCRSG), stakeholders had the opportunity to share key interests in the study region with the broader group. This document summarizes the information shared by each stakeholder during plenary session.

This summary is not intended to reflect a verbatim account of what each stakeholder said, but rather captures general themes and interests expressed. This summary may be useful in considering the broader context for how marine protected areas (MPAs) in the north central coast should be designed and to identify opportunities for cross-interest collaboration.

During this activity, stakeholder group members were asked to consider the question:

"What areas within the study region are important to you, and what do you want other NCCRSG members to know about them?"

Below are the summarized responses for each primary NCCRSG representative present (or alternative, if the primary was unavailable). We recognize that this list of interests is only partial. The I-Team will continue to invite NCCRSG members to express their interests throughout the north central coast process.

Dirk Ammerman: Representing the Sea Urchin fishery and divers. Wants MPAs to benefit not just this fishery but the whole ocean. Especially concerned about the stocks at the Farallon Islands, Point Arena, and the two sub-regions to the south.

Bill Bernard: Represents the abalone fishery, which is now in recovery status. Important areas include: Robison Point, Horseshoe Point, Tomales Point, Gualala Point, Salt Point, and Point Arena, among others. Index points are also important – Arena Cove, Salt Point, Ocean Cove, Timber Cove, Fort Ross State Park. Defacto depth reserve is the breath hold length.

Bob Breen: Advocating for invertebrates and macroalgae. Subregion 5 has been his focus. Moss Beach is very diverse for macroalgae. Invertebrate collection for consumption needs to be considered.

Christopher Chin: Represents a conservationist viewpoint. Wants to have healthy, productive oceans for future generations. Wants to see species level return to where they were before the impact of modern industrialism. Promotes a long-term ecosystem perspective

Josh Churchman: Representing the nearshore fishery. Is interested in sustaining small coastal communities, their fishermen, and their heritage. Emphasized the importance of transparent sharing of objective technical information and analyses.

Henry Fastenau: Primary interest is subtidal diving research sites. Has worked in certain areas for over 20 years. Would like to see research sites that are accessible by beach or by

boat without having to spend several hours to get there. Secondary interest is non-consumptive recreation.

Karen Garrison: Wants to protect the whole range of species and habitats represented; wants to protect heritage sites for future generations; wants respectful process and good policy results based on sound scientific information; wants mutual gains to be achieved; and wants a design that can be improved along the way.

Peter Grenell: Three areas of importance: (1) improving the whole process so that the north central coast study region is adequately taken care of while establishing an improved model for the rest of the MLPA effort; (2) improving monitoring and assessment; (3) integrating MPAs appropriately with other existing management tools.

Ken Jones: Representing pier and nearshore anglers. Wants to ensure that some areas are kept open for this fishing because it provides a low-cost activity for families and kids, especially in rural areas.

Francesca Koe: Representing diving (free and scuba). Specific areas of interest are Subregion 1 and 2, as well as Farallon Islands. Believes that education, acquired through diving experiences and otherwise, is key to achieving good stewardship of resources.

Irina Kogan: Representing Gulf of the Farallons National Marine Sanctuary. Main interests are in maintaining healthy populations with an ecosystem focus. Wants biological hotspots to be considered and best available science to be used.

Michael McHenry: Representing the wetfish community. Expressed an interest in the economic sustainability of the wetfish fishery. He also expressed some personal conservation-based interests. Important areas include the Farallon Islands.

Craig Merrilees: Representing commercial fishing folks and conservation interests. Salmon, crab, and rockfish fisheries are important, as well as small coastal communities. Monitoring and enforcement are a key to the success of the MLPA.

Kellyx Nelson: Doesn't have interest in a particular outcome, but rather in an open, inclusive policy process resulting in a win-win scenario.

Don Neubacher: Representing Golden Gate National Recreational Area and Point Reyes National Seashore. Wants to ensure that the final network system is sufficient to benefit the full suite of species and habitats, especially unique ones like Tomales Bay and Drake's Estero.

Nelson Pinola: Representing Native American tribes including Miwok, Southern Central Pomo, and others. Looking to preserve cultural resources including gathering of traditional food and materials for religious/ceremonial purposes; the use of areas for religious/ceremonial purposes. Onshore and nearshore access is important.

Santi Roberts: Represents Oceana, an international marine conservation organization. Wants to see ecosystem-level protection and is interested in linking the MLPA process with the entire west coast ecosystem. Monitoring and adaptive management are very important.

Ben Sleeter: Representing the Coastside Fishing Club. Areas of importance: Duxbury Reef, Point Reyes, Farallon Islands, and areas close to ports. Ensuring salmon and Dungeness crab fisheries is very important. Good conservation based on sound science in the nearshore marine environment.

Fred Smith: Many areas are connected and therefore important. Wants to see an overall abundance and diversity of marine wildlife, and a really balanced plan that works.

Craig Swolgaard: Representing California State Parks, of which there are 16 state parks in this study region. Interested in preserving biodiversity and providing recreational opportunities. Wants an effective system of MPAs along the coast. Public access to parks is a key interest.

Ed Tavasieff: Representing hook and line halibut fishermen. He is interested in several areas, such as the Pescadero area, Bonita Cove, South Cove, Duxbury, and others. Since the boats are small, fishermen aren't able to traverse long distances and are very weather-dependent.

Cassidy Teufel: Representing California Coastal Commission. Wants to preserve existing coastal access points; wants to enhance marine productivity for intrinsic value and for future users' enjoyment.

Sean White: Representing recreational fishing, particularly kayak fishing, in addition to fishery scientists. Wants to protect hotspots similar to those used by recreational fishers, but also less used remote areas.

Jay Yokomizo: Sportfishing anglers and charter boats are most interested in areas nearshore, Duxbury reef, Farallon Islands, as well as areas accessible during bad weather, in addition to rocky structures. Need to have access to sandy areas certain parts of the year, and need to preserve some areas for Dungeness crab and Sanddab.

Work Group Guidance for Initial MPA Proposal Recommendations

California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative

North Central Coast Study Region

Work group charge

Three cross-interest work groups will be convened with the charge of developing initial recommendations for marine protected area (MPA) proposals for the MLPA North Central Coast Study Region for presentation and discussion at the October MLPA North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (NCCRS) meeting. These initial recommendations should be as complete as possible given the timeframe for developing them; they should identify areas where the group agrees an MPA is appropriate (and proposed designation and regulations if possible). The work groups should also identify areas of disagreement within the group. In these cases, work groups should suggest options for consideration by the full NCCRS.

Staff do not expect these initial recommendations to be fully formed proposals, but they should follow the general format of the MPA proposal template. Staff acknowledge that other groups (single or multiple interest) may also be developing MPA proposals simultaneously and we encourage those ideas to be brought into the work group process. It should be noted that during this timeframe (August-October), I-Team staff support will be focused on these work groups.

Proposals should be developed based on the best information available, acknowledging that not all information that is forthcoming is yet available. Key information sources include the draft *Regional Profile of the North Central Coast Study Region (Alder Creek near Point Arena to Pigeon Point, California)* and associated maps, GIS data layers available on the Internet map service website and in the MPA decision support tool (Doris, available at www.marinemap.org/mlpa), information gathered during joint fact-finding activities, and stakeholder personal knowledge.

Work group structure

NCCRS members (primaries and alternates) are asked to participate in one of three work groups. Composition of work groups is pre-assigned to ensure a broad balance across interests and expertise. This approach encouraging cross-interest dialogue and full participation by NCCRS members responds to lessons learned from the central coast process. Work group composition is as follows:

Emerald Group	Jade Group	Turquoise Group
Bob Wilson	Ben Sleeter	Ben Becker
Bud James	Cassidy Teufel	Bill Bernard
Craig Swolgaard	Christopher Chin	Bob Breen
Hedley Prince	Craig Merrilees	Dave Schaub
Henry Fastenau	Dave Yarger	Ed Tavasieff
Irina Kogan	Dirk Ammerman	Ellen Faurot-Daniels
Jay Yokomizo	Don Neubacher	Francesca Koe
Josh Churchman	Fred Smith	John Mellor
Kellyx Nelson	Jim Hobbs	Nelson Pinola
Ken Jones	Karen Garrison	Patricia King
Michael McHenry	Karen Reyna	Richard Charter
Neil Desai	Lance Morgan	Santi Roberts
Paul Pierce	Michael Corden	Sean White
Phil Sanders	Nick Tipon	Tom Baty
Rick Johnson	Peter Grenell	Tom Estes
Samantha Murray	Russell Herring	Tom Mattusch

Schedule, timing, and organization of work group activities

Each work group will have the opportunity to meet twice with staff support between the August 22-23 and October 16-17 NCCRSG meetings. Work group meeting dates with staff support are September 7 and 25 (locations to be determined). Participation by teleconference is a fallback possibility, but in-person participation is strongly preferred. Each work group meeting will be supported by MLPA Initiative and DFG staff (i.e., planning, GIS, facilitation). Outside of the staff supported meetings, work groups are encouraged to meet by phone or in person to complete their task.

Staff has provided a template to capture critical information needed in each MPA recommendation (e.g., boundaries, designation, regulations, MPA-specific regulations, etc.). Stakeholders will strive to contribute input from their respective constituencies and will work together toward identifying, at the minimum, areas of “convergence” and “divergence” within their work groups. Sharing among work groups is encouraged.

October 16-17, 2007 NCCRSG meeting

Work groups will each present their initial recommendations at the beginning of the October meeting. NCCRSG members will provide comment to inform revisions. Further revisions to the initial recommendations will also be informed by presentations on the latest information available (e.g., socioeconomic data). Work groups will revise their recommendations into first draft proposals at the October meeting. First round proposals will be “packaged” to be consistent in format.

Staff intend to forward these three draft proposals to the MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT) and MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF) for initial review and evaluation. As such, we ask that initial proposal recommendations be completed by the end of the October meeting.

At the end of the October meeting, we will reassess how to move forward with MPA proposal development. Next steps may include continuing with the work groups or forming new work groups. Additional MPA proposal development will take place in both work group and plenary settings.

Post-October meeting next steps

Preliminary evaluations based on the science guidelines will be provided by staff and the SAT North Central Coast Evaluation Sub-team to the full SAT for review at its November 13, 2007 meeting and to the BRTF at its November 29-30 meeting. SAT and BRTF feedback and guidance will be provided to NCCRSG members to inform ongoing MPA proposal development.

Contact information for support during MPA planning

- General planning support: Mary Gleason (mgleason@tnc.org, 831-333-2049), Evan Fox (evanwfox@gmail.com, 650-387-9306), or Nicole Douglas (nicoledouglas.mlpa@yahoo.com, 831-359-3773)
- Spatial data layers (GIS) or analysis: Paulo Serpa (pserpa@dfg.ca.gov, 831-649-7143)
- Internet map service (IMS) site or Doris (MPA decision support tool): Will McClintock (mcclintock@msi.ucsb.edu, 805-893-8782)
- Meeting logistics: Delbra Gibbs (dga_mlpa@sbcglobl.net, 916.424.8897)

California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative
Members of the North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group
August 25, 2007

Dirk Ammerman, Owner, Pacific Rim Seafoods

Tom Baty, independent sportfisher and conservationist (alternate for Craig Merrilees)

Ben Becker, Pacific Coast Science and Learning Center Director, Point Reyes National Seashore
(alternate for Don Neubacher)

Bill Bernard, Member, Abalone Advisory Group

Bob Breen, educator

Richard Charter, Associate, Defenders of Wildlife Marine Program (alternate for Karen Garrison)

Christopher Chin, Executive Director, Center for Oceanic Awareness, Research and Education
(alternate for Samantha Murray)

Josh Churchman, commercial fisherman

Michael Corden, Member, United Pier and Shore Anglers Association (alternate for Ken Jones)

Neal Desai, National Parks Conservation Association (alternate for Frederick Smith)

Tom Estes, commercial fisherman (alternate for Michael McHenry)

Ellen Faurot-Daniels, Oil Spill Supervisor, California Coastal Commission

Dr. Henry C. Fastenau, Diving and Boating Safety Officer, Bodega Marine Laboratory, UC Davis

Karen Garrison, Co-Director, Natural Resources Defense Council Ocean Program

Peter Grenell, General Manager, San Mateo County Harbor District

Russ Herring, Secretary/Treasurer, Southern Pacific Sinkers Fish Club (alternate for Bill Bernard)

James Hobbs, recreational kayaker (alternate for Sean White)

Bud James, President, Dive Club of Silicon Valley (alternate for Francesca Koe)

Rick Johnson, docent and teacher (alternate for Bob Breen)

Ken Jones, President, United Pier and Shore Anglers of California

Francesca Koe, VP and Managing Director, Underground Ads

Patricia King, ocean conservationist and docent (alternate for Kellyx Nelson)

Irina Kogan, Resource Protection Specialist, Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary

Tom Mattusch, Owner, Hulicat Sportfishing, (alternate for Jay Yokomizo)

Michael McHenry, commercial fisherman

John Mellor, commercial fisherman (alternate for Josh Churchman)

Craig Merrilees, educator and recreational fisherman

Dr. Lance E. Morgan, Chief Scientist, Marine Conservation Biology Institute (alternate for Dr. Henry Fastenau)

Samantha Murray, Ecosystem Program Manager, The Ocean Conservancy

Kellyx Nelson, Executive Director, San Mateo County Resource Conservation District

Don Neubacher, Point Reyes National Seashore Superintendent, National Park Service

Paul Pierce, Coastside Fishing Club (alternate for Ben Sleeter)

Nelson Pinola, Chairman, Manchester-Point Arena Band of Pomo Indians

Hedley Prince, Port of San Francisco (alternate for Peter Grenell)

Karen Reyna, Resource Protection Specialist, Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary
(alternate for Irina Kogan)

Santi Roberts, California Project Manager, Oceana

Phil Sanders, Member, California Abalone Association (alternate for Dirk Ammerman)

Dave Schaub, Natural Resources Program Manager, California Department of Parks and Recreation
(alternate for Craig Swolgaard)

Ben Sleeter, Political Advocate/Scientist, Coastside Fishing Club

Craig Swolgaard, Natural Resources Program Manager, California Department of Parks and
Recreation

Frederick Smith, Executive Director, Environmental Action Committee of West Marin

Ed Tavasieff, Owner, California Fresh Fish and Secretary, Pacific Fisheries Enhancement Foundation

Cassidy Teufel, Coastal Program Analyst, California Coastal Commission (alternate for Ellen Faurot-
Daniels)

Nick Tipon, Member, Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria (alternate for Nelson Pinola)

Sean K. White, Owner, Great White Kayak Company and Fisheries Biologist, Sonoma County Water
Agency

Robert J. Wilson, Policy Liaison, The Marine Mammal Center (alternate for Santi Roberts)

Dave Yarger, Past President, Fisherman's Marketing Association of Bodega Bay (alternate for Ed
Tavasieff)

Jay Yokomizo, Captain, Emeryville Sportfishing

**California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative
North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group
Proposed Agenda – Work Group Sessions
(proposed September 4, 2007)**

**September 7, 2007
10:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.**

**Four Points by Sheraton
1010 Northgate Drive
San Rafael, CA**

MEETING OBJECTIVES

- Begin developing marine protected area (MPA) recommendations in work group settings
 - Identify possible MPAs; identify MPA boundaries, type, habitats captured, and goals/objectives achieved
 - Consider possible implications for other existing/potential MPAs and other consumptive/non-consumptive uses
 - Identify habitats not represented
 - Identify important areas of divergence and identify possible options in MPA proposals to address this divergence
- Plan next steps in preparation for September 25, 2007 work group sessions

WORK SESSION AGENDA

Friday, September 7	
<i>9:30 a.m.</i>	<i>Arrival, refreshments and greetings</i>
10:00 a.m.	[Plenary] Welcome, brief introductions, and agenda review
10:10 a.m.	[Plenary] Review charge to the work groups and discuss plan for developing initial MPA recommendations (Attachments 1-4)
10:30 a.m.	Work groups begin developing initial MPA recommendations (Attachments 5-6)
<i>12:00 noon – 1:00 p.m.</i>	<i>Lunch (provided onsite; work groups break for lunch on own schedule)</i>
1:00 p.m.	Develop initial MPA recommendations (continued)
2:45 p.m.	Recap progress made and discuss next step preparations for September 25, 2007 work group meeting
<i>3:00 p.m.</i>	<i>Adjourn</i>

Attachments (key meeting and reference materials)

1. Guidance for work group activity (from August NCCRSG meeting)
2. Revised provisional regional goals and objectives (as amended at the August NCCRSG meeting)
3. Guidelines for developing marine protected area proposals (from July NCCRSG meeting; includes MLPA, DFG, and master plan for MPAs guidance)
4. Template for draft MPA proposals (from August NCCRSG meeting)

5. Summary of NCCRSG member interests (from plenary session at August NCCRSG meeting)
6. Summary of initial identified “areas of importance” (from August NCCRSG meeting)

* Please bring your copy of the draft regional profile

Other supporting tools and materials (to be provided onsite)

1. GIS data layers
2. DORIS (MPA decision support tool)
3. Maps (study region, existing MPAs, nautical charts)
4. Flip charts and markers (fine and wide points)

**California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative
North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group
Proposed Agenda – Work Group Sessions II**

**September 25, 2007
10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.**

**Four Points by Sheraton
1010 Northgate Drive
San Rafael, CA**

Work Sessions Objectives

- Provide orientation
 - Reconfirm work group charge
 - Describe I-Team adjustments
- Continue development of initial MPA recommendations in work group settings
 - Identify and discuss possible MPA recommendations
 - Discuss potential tradeoffs between MPA recommendations
 - Identify options to deal with areas of divergence
- Plan next steps to make additional revisions by October 4, 2007 deadline

Work Sessions Agenda

10:00 AM	[Plenary] Welcome, introductions, and agenda review
10:10 AM	[Plenary] Review charge to the work groups and discuss game plan for continuing development of initial MPA recommendations (Attachments 1, 2) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review charge to work groups• Review process and anticipated work products for September 25 work sessions and October 16-17, 2007 NCCRSG meeting
10:40 AM	[Work groups] Continue development of initial MPA recommendations
12:00 noon	<i>Lunch (provided on site; work groups can break for lunch on their own schedule)</i>
1:00 PM	[Work groups] Continue development of initial MPA recommendations
3:45 PM	[Work groups] Recap progress made and discuss next step preparations for October 4 submittal to I-Team
4:00 PM	<i>Adjourn</i>

Attachments (transmitted to work groups on September 18, 2007)

1. Staff responses to planning related questions from Sept. 7 work sessions
2. Summary of MPA planning guidance

Key Reference Materials (these were distributed at previous NCCRSG meetings and again by email (September 4) in advance of the last work session; PLEASE BRING YOUR COPIES)

- A. Guidance for work group activity (from August NCCRSG meeting)
- B. Revised regional goals and objectives (from August NCCRSG meeting)

Revised September 24, 2007

- C. Guidelines for developing marine protected area proposals (from July NCCRSG meeting; includes MLPA, DFG feasibility, and draft master plan science guidance)
 - D. Template for draft MPA proposals (from August NCCRSG meeting)
 - E. Summary of NCCRSG member interests (from August NCCRSG meeting)
 - F. Summary of initial identified “areas of importance” (from August NCCRSG meeting)
- * Please bring your own copies of the draft regional profile

**California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative
North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group
Proposed Meeting Agenda
(revised October 16, 2007)**

***Tuesday, October 16, 2007 at 10:00 a.m.
Wednesday, October 17, 2007 at 8:00 a.m.***

**Gualala Arts Center *
46501 Gualala Road
Gualala, CA 95445
707.884.1138**

Members of the public are invited to attend the meeting in person or view and listen to the meeting via simultaneous webcasting on the Internet; an archived version will be available approximately two days after the meeting. Please visit the MLPA website at www.dfg.ca.gov/mlpa/meetings.asp for more information.

MEETING OBJECTIVES

- *Work groups to present “interim work products: draft option(s) for an MPA array” and receive North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (NCCRSG) comments*
- *Receive MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT) feedback on draft regional goals and objectives, discuss revisions, and adopt provisional goals and objectives*
- *Receive presentation of other initial marine protected area (MPA) proposals*
- *Receive report from SAT meetings and responses to science questions*
- *Receive preliminary reports on socioeconomic data collection*
- *Work groups to revise draft MPA array options for initial SAT review/evaluation*
- *Discuss intended strategy for continued development of draft options for MPA arrays*

MEETING AGENDA: Tuesday, October 16

9:30 a.m.		<i>Arrival, refreshments and greetings</i>
10:00 a.m.	1.	Welcome, agenda review, and brief introductions
10:20 a.m.	2.	Review MLPA Initiative process timeline (Handout A)
10:35 a.m.	3.	Updates and briefings (Handout N) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Update on regional profile (Handout B)• Report on data collection efforts• Update on recent SAT meetings• Update from recent BRTF meetings
10:45 a.m.	4.	Work groups to present draft initial option(s) for an MPA array (Handouts C-E and O) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Turquoise, emerald and jade work groups

** This facility is accessible to persons with disabilities. To request reasonable accommodations for a disability, please contact California Relay Service (at least two days prior to the meeting) at 800.735.2929 (TT) or 800.735.2922 (voice) and ask them to contact the California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative at 916.653.5656.*

MEETING AGENDA: Tuesday, October 16 (continued)

12:15 p.m.		<i>Lunch (provided onsite for NCCRSG members)</i>
1:00 p.m.	5.	Discuss, revise, and adopt provisional north central coast regional goals and objectives (Attachment 1) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review SAT response to NCCRSG question about regional goals and objectives • Revise and adopt provisional regional goals and objectives
1:30 p.m.	6.	Receive presentations of “external” MPA proposals (Handouts F-I and P-R) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposals A, B, C and D
2:50 p.m.	7.	Receive report on recent SAT meetings (Handout S) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAT responses to science questions (Handout J) • Update on SAT “evaluation framework” • List of species likely to benefit (Attachment 2)
3:20 p.m.		<i>Break</i>
3:35 p.m.	8.	Receive preliminary reports on socioeconomic data collection <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commercial fishing data collection (Handout T) • Recreational fishing data collection (Handout U) • Non-consumptive ocean uses data collection (Handout K, V)
4:20 p.m.	9.	Public comment (Handouts L, M)
5:20 p.m.		<i>Break</i>
5:35 p.m.	10.	Plenary discussion of draft initial options for MPA arrays; cross-cutting observations and comments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What have you heard today that might cause you to consider revising your work group's draft initial options for MPA arrays?
6:15 p.m.		<i>Recess for dinner</i>
6:45 p.m.		<i>Dinner offsite for NCCRSG members</i>
8:00 p.m.		<i>Optional evening work group sessions; initiate discussions to revise draft options for MPA arrays</i>

MEETING AGENDA: Wednesday, October 17

8:00 a.m.	11.	Plenary discussion of draft initial options for MPA arrays
8:30 a.m.	12.	Work group breakout sessions to revise “draft initial options for MPA arrays” (breakfast provided for NCCRSG members)
12:00 p.m.		<i>Lunch (provided onsite for NCCRSG members)</i>
12:45 p.m.	13.	Work groups and staff confirm text and shapes of draft options for MPA arrays
1:45 p.m.	14.	Public comment
2:00 p.m.	15.	Work groups report back to plenary on draft options for MPA arrays <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Turquoise, emerald and jade work groups
2:45 p.m.	16.	Discuss strategy for continuing MPA development process and next steps
3:15 p.m.	17.	Wrap up and review next steps <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirm any science questions posed • Review NCCRSG meeting #5 objectives
3:30 p.m.		<i>Adjourn</i>

ATTACHMENTS

1. Draft provisional regional goals and objectives (August 22, 2007)
2. List of species likely to benefit from marine protected areas

HANDOUTS

- A. Summary of MLPA Initiative process timeline
- B. Revised north central coast regional profile
- C. Initial options for an MPA array – Turquoise work group (template and maps)
- D. Initial options for an MPA array – Emerald work group (template and maps)
- E. Initial options for an MPA array – Jade work group (template and maps)
- F. External MPA proposal A (template and maps)
- G. External MPA proposal B (template and maps)
- H. External MPA proposal C (template and maps)
- I. External MPA proposal D (template and maps)
- J. SAT responses to science questions: July 10-11 questions, August 22-23 questions, and September 10 questions
- K. Draft report on community mapping of non-consumptive ocean uses
- L. Individual MPA concepts submitted externally to the work group process
- M. Summary of opportunities for public participation in the north central coast process
- N. PowerPoint presentation with updates on the regional profile, data collection, and SAT meetings

- O. PowerPoint presentation regarding emerald draft ideas for marine protected areas
- P. PowerPoint presentation regarding draft external MPA proposal B
- Q. PowerPoint presentation regarding draft external MPA proposal C
- R. PowerPoint presentation regarding draft external MPA proposal D
- S. PowerPoint Presentation regarding SAT questions and work groups
- T. PowerPoint Presentation regarding commercial data collection
- U. PowerPoint Presentation regarding recreational data collection
- V. PowerPoint Presentation regarding community mapping of non-consumptive ocean uses

Key Outcomes Memorandum

Date: October 26, 2007

To: Members, MLPA North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (NCCRSG)

From: Scott McCreary and Eric Poncelet, CONCUR, Inc.

Re: Key Outcomes Memorandum – October 16-17, 2007 NCCRSG Meeting

cc: MLPA Initiative Staff and California Department of Fish and Game MLPA Staff

Executive Summary – Key Outcomes

On October 16-17, 2007, the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) Initiative North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (NCCRSG) participated in its fourth meeting, in Gualala, CA. **Key outcomes** from the meeting are as follows:

- The NCCRSG completed final adoption of “provisional north central coast regional goals and objectives,” taking into consideration guidance from the MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT).
- NCCRSG cross-interest work groups successfully completed work on six “draft options for marine protected area (MPA) arrays.” Each of the work groups completed two array options to move to the SAT for review.
- The NCCRSG received presentations on four “external” MPA proposals developed outside of the work group process.
- The NCCRSG received presentations on other key topics to inform work group development of draft options for MPA arrays, including:
 - Work group interim draft options for MPA arrays
 - Preliminary socioeconomic analyses (including commercial fishing and non-consumptive ocean uses)
 - SAT guidance on species likely to benefit from MPAs and answers to NCCRSG science questions
 - California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) feasibility comments on the draft options for MPA arrays
 - Revised regional profile
- The NCCRSG identified additional science and policy questions for I-Team staff and SAT consideration
- The NCCRSG received comments and suggestions from members of the public on a wide range of topics pertaining to MPA delineation and impacts on ecological protection, local communities, and a range of consumptive and nonconsumptive opportunities.
- The NCCRSG formed a subgroup to identify seabird/marine mammal disturbance areas.

Key **next steps** include (other next steps are listed in section III below):

- I-Team staff to “package” information and data from the draft array options and external proposals for SAT review.
- I-Team staff and NCCRSG members to plan for a November 28, 2007 work session in San Rafael, CA.

I. Meeting Participants and Materials

Twenty-two NCCRSB primary members and eighteen alternate members participated in the October 16-17, 2007 meeting.

California Secretary for Resources Mike Chrisman, and California Fish and Game Commissioner Mike Sutton attended the meeting as observers. MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF) members Don Benninghoven and Cathy Reheis-Boyd also attended.

MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team members participating in the meeting included: Sarah Allen, Caroline Hermans, Karina Nielsen, and Astrid Scholz.

MLPA Initiative and California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) staff—collectively known as the “I-Team”—staffed the meeting.

Meeting materials, including copies of the PowerPoint presentations, may be found on the MLPA website at: http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mlpa/meeting_101607.asp

II. Key Outcomes

A. NCCRSB adopted provisional north central coast regional goals and objectives

NCCRSB members unanimously adopted “provisional north central coast regional goals and objectives.” In taking this action, the NCCRSB incorporated feedback from the SAT on goal 4, objective 1. The revised goal 4, objective 1 now reads: “Include within MPAs the following habitat types: estuaries, the intertidal zone at the Farallon Islands, and subtidal waters (including the water column and benthic habitats) around the Farallon Islands.”

The adopted provisional regional goals and objectives are attached as Attachment 1. They will now be forwarded to the BRTF for approval.

B. NCCRSB work groups developed six “draft options for MPA arrays”

Three NCCRSB cross-interest work groups (named the emerald, jade, and turquoise groups) met in extended breakout sessions and continued the work begun in August and during their September work sessions. Each work group successfully developed two draft MPA array options (identified simply as “A” and “B”) to be forwarded to the SAT and BRTF for review and evaluation.

These work group deliberations were informed by several presentations and plenary discussions (see section II.C below).

C. NCCRSB received presentations on key topics to inform work group development of “draft options for MPA arrays”

Work group deliberations on draft options for MPA arrays were informed by a series of presentations. These included presentations on: work group interim draft options for MPA arrays, submitted “external” MPA proposals, preliminary analyses of socioeconomic data,

SAT feedback, DFG feasibility guidance, and the revised MLPA regional profile. Work group deliberations were also informed by public comment and plenary discussions looking across all of this information. Each of these key informational topics is described below.

1. Interim draft options for MPA arrays prepared by the work groups

Each work group presented its interim work on draft options for MPA arrays to the NCCRSG showing the results of their September 7 and 25 work sessions.

2. MPA proposals “external” to the work group process

The following “external” MPA proposals were presented to the NCCRSG. The external proposals were developed outside of the NCCRSG work group process. Each was co-developed by at least one NCCRSG member acting in concert with outside stakeholders.

- External Proposal A: Presented by Chuck Cappotto, on behalf of the Fisherman’s Marketing Association of Bodega Bay
- External Proposal B: Presented by Dan Wolford, Coastside Fishing Club, on behalf of a recreational fishing coalition
- External Proposal C: Presented by Christopher Chin, NCCRSG, on behalf of a conservation coalition
- External Proposal D: Presented by Santi Roberts, NCCRSG, on behalf of Oceana

3. Status report on preliminary socioeconomic analyses

NCCRSG members received presentations or status updates on three socioeconomic studies.

a. Commercial fishing grounds and socioeconomic data collection: draft report and maps

Astrid Scholz of Ecotrust presented a draft report on preliminary socioeconomic data from its analysis of commercial fishing. For confidentiality reasons, NCCRSG members were only provided access to data maps during the work group sessions.

NCCRSG members requested that Ecotrust generate and provide future maps that illustrate both “weighted importance” and “stated importance”.

b. Update on recreational fishing analysis

Astrid Scholz confirmed that socioeconomic results for recreational fishing would be available in draft form at the December 11-12, 2007 NCCRSG meeting.

c. Non-consumptive ocean uses for the north central coast study region

Mimi D’lorio of the National MPA Center presented a draft report on community mapping of non-consumptive ocean uses in the study region. The analysis focused on intensity of use for the following non-consumptive uses of the ocean: kayaking and canoeing, whale watching and wildlife viewing, diving and underwater photography, and tide pooling.

4. SAT guidance

I-Team members provided NCCRSG members with the following information from the SAT:

- List of species likely to benefit from MPAs in the north central coast study region
- Draft responses to science questions posed by the NCCRSG at the July and August NCCRSG meetings.

NCCRSG members asked follow-up questions, which are detailed in section II.D below.

5. Initial DFG feedback based on feasibility guidance for delineating MPAs

DFG staff presented preliminary feedback on the work group draft options for MPA arrays. DFG staff reiterated that while its feedback constituted guidance and not requirements, adhering to the guidance would greatly facilitate implementation and enforcement of eventual MPAs.

DFG staff provided the following key guidance:

- Avoid “floating corners” (e.g., additional offshore corners not at the outside edge of the MPA) unless they fall on simple latitude/longitude coordinates.
- When possible, use due north/south MPA boundaries. An exception would be to use recognizable structures, like buoys. Note: DFG can not ensure new buoys will be installed to address areas where they do not presently exist, but the NCCRSG can make a request if desired.
- When possible, avoid “L-shaped” MPAs.
- When possible, locate MPA boundaries on whole minutes of latitude or longitude, or whole tenths of minutes.
- Using “distance from shore” for the boundary of an MPA may work for protecting breeding colonies in intertidal or nearshore zones, but it is better to assign coordinates to a line that approximates that distance. It is more acceptable to use “distance from shore” around islands, especially if the distances are large (e.g., 1 or 2 miles).
- In general, circular shapes are not preferred, but circular MPA boundaries around islands (e.g., Farallons) may be acceptable.
- Avoid depth contours as boundaries, as they are difficult to enforce.

DFG staff will develop a memorandum to provide regulatory mechanisms to address seabird and marine mammal disturbance issues, and will transmit this to the NCCRSG by the end of October.

6. Revised regional profile

I-Team staff provided NCCRSG members with a revised version of the MLPA Initiative *Regional Profile for the North Central Coast Study Region (Alder Creek/Point Arena to Pigeon Point, California)* dated October 8, 2007. The revised document reflects the incorporation of numerous comments from NCCRSG members and other members of the public over the past four months.

D. NCCRSG identified additional science and policy questions for staff/SAT consideration

1. Science questions

NCCRSG members raised several science questions, both in the plenary and work group settings, and requested that these be forwarded to the SAT for consideration. Questions discussed include the following:

- What impact would the delineation of a 100-foot nearshore “ribbon”, within which shore-based angling is permitted, have on the protection level of an MPA? (Note: I-Team staff noted that this question will be addressed through the SAT evaluation.)
- Is an MPA that protects rockfish around the Farallon Islands likely to increase the abundance of juvenile rockfish in the subregion?
- The NCCRSG would like the SAT to (re)consider and comment on potential additions to the list of species likely to benefit from MPAs. (Potential suggestions included white sharks, salmonids, and flat and northern abalone.) NCCRSG members agreed to prepare a list of possible additions, along with stated rationales, for consideration by I-Team staff and the SAT.
- Would the designation of a state marine reserve or other MPA around the mouth of a major estuary make a significant contribution to protecting anadromous fish that spawn upstream? Does the SAT have comments on what size, distance from the mouth, and setback is likely to be protective? Would a fairly tight boundary accomplish resource protection?
- What impact would the delineation of “vessel no-go zones” of varying widths have on the level of protection assigned to an MPA?

Per the protocol established at the August 22-23, 2007 NCCRSG meeting, these questions will be reviewed by I-Team staff and the SAT co-chairs to determine their appropriateness for SAT review. I-Team staff will report back on how each question was addressed at the next NCCRSG meeting.

2. Policy questions

NCCRSG members raised several policy issues for I-Team consideration, and potential consideration by DFG, legal counsel or the BRTF.

- What is the feasibility with regard to enforcement of delineating a 100-yard inshore SMCA “ribbon” that would allow only shore-based angling?
- How should the NCCRSG consider underwater telecom cables that run through the study region in the NCCRSG process? Would designation of an MPA preclude the future laying of cables in the area? Is the laying of cables consistent with the three MPA designations?
- How should the NCCRSG address potential wave energy projects in the NCCRSG process? Would designation of an MPA preclude developing wave energy projects in the area? Are wave energy projects consistent with the three MPA designations?

- What regulatory options exist to protect against disturbance of seabirds and marine mammals by vessels of all types?

Staff will prepare memoranda to address these issues. One of these memoranda will summarize existing DFG guidance on special closures.

3. Other questions

- Where is the sewer outfall from San Francisco in relation to the boundaries of the Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary?

4. Formation of NCCRSG sub-group to address disturbance issues

Several NCCRSG members expressed interest in forming a sub-group to further explore the issue of disturbance to seabirds and marine mammals. Francesca Koe agreed to serve as NCCRSG point person in working with I-Team staff (Susan Ashcraft as lead) to organize these discussions. NCCRSG members also agreed to prepare a list of key seabird and marine mammal disturbance areas in the study region, building on the draft list developed by the National Marine Sanctuary Program.

E. Public comment

The meeting included designated public comment periods on both day 1 and day 2. More than eighty members of the public attended the meeting. Approximately thirty members of the public provided comments. Prior to the comments, I-Team staff reviewed the opportunities for public participation in the broader MLPA Initiative process.

Key comments included the following advice to NCCRSG members:

- The NCCRSG is doing important work that will have a significant impact on ocean resources, communities, and livelihoods in the northern part of the study region.
- The northern part of the study region is an important area for abalone diving and other recreational fishing activities. These are key sources of economic income for the area.
- NCCRSG members need to consider the effects of displaced fishing effort caused by siting of particular MPAs.
- NCCRSG members need to take safety issues into account when siting MPAs. Due to prevailing northerly winds, it is important to keep some areas just north of ports open to fishing and anchoring. The issue of displaced effort may also result in some users traveling to less safe areas.
- The NCCRSG should consider the location of existing public access points when siting MPAs, and should continue to allow recreational fishing near these access points. The Sea Ranch and Anchor Bay were two often-mentioned areas where access points exist.
- Alternatively, NCCRSG members were urged to consider the impacts on private property when siting MPAs. Placing “no take” reserves adjacent to private property was identified as an imposition on private property rights. Some commenters observed that private property can act as a *de facto* MPA in helping to protect wildlife and habitat.
- NCCRSG members should site MPAs, where possible, near low use areas.

- Siting of MPAs needs to take into account existing fishery regulations.
- Any implementation of MPAs on the north central coast needs to be adequately enforced. Adequate funds need to be made available to support this enforcement.
- The NCCRSG should consider protection of harbor seal rookeries in The Sea Ranch area, including exploration of a possible seasonal closure.
- The NCCRSG should consider key ecosystem relationships in its deliberations. Examples include the relationship between urchins and kelp, and the potential relationship between sea otters and other forms of marine life (if otters were to return to the area).
- The public appreciates receiving as much information on the MLPA Initiative process as possible, and in a timely manner.

The I-Team noted that NCCRSG members, in their work groups, had actively considered and discussed this advice as they worked to complete their draft options for MPA arrays. I-Team members also noted the intent to convene at least one public workshop in the northern part of the study region later in the process when the NCCRSG progresses further with its work.

F. Overview of NCCRSG process timeline

I-Team staff presented an overview of the NCCRSG process timeline through spring 2008. The purpose of this presentation was to help situate current NCCRSG efforts within the broader north central coast process. Key milestones include:

- December 11-12, 2007 NCCRSG meeting: NCCRSG to continue its work on MPA arrays to develop draft MPA proposals. This will be followed by another round of SAT and BRTF review, as well as California Fish and Game Commission initial review.
- February 6-7, 2008: NCCRSG to develop final suite of MPA proposals. This will be followed by SAT analysis, BRTF action, and forwarding of recommendations to the California Fish and Game Commission

A document outlining the timeline is attached as Attachment 2.

G. Upcoming NCCRSG meetings

1. November 28, 2007 work session

I-Team staff scheduled an NCCRSG work session for November 28, 2007. A major goal of this work session is to begin addressing SAT and BRTF feedback on the current round of draft options for MPA arrays.

2. Next NCCRSG meeting is scheduled for December 11-12, 2007 in Pacifica, CA

Key objectives for the December 11-12, 2007 NCCRSG meeting are to:

- Receive SAT and BRTF feedback on the “draft options for MPA arrays” and “external” proposals presented and developed at the October 16-17, 2007 NCCRSG meeting.
- Receive informational presentations on socioeconomic data (including preliminary analyses of recreational fishing data), tribal interests, and water quality issues.

- Develop next iteration of MPA arrays for SAT and BRTF review and evaluation.

III. Recap of Next Steps

A. Key next steps for NCCRSG members

1. NCCRSG members to prepare a list of potential additions to the “species likely to benefit from MPAs” list for consideration by the SAT. Santi Roberts to serve as point-person.
2. Interested NCCRSG members to form a subgroup to further discuss key issues involving disturbance of seabirds and marine mammals. Francesca Koe to serve as NCCRSG point-person as they coordinate with I-Team staff (Susan Ashcraft as lead). NCCRSG members to prepare a draft list of key disturbance zones in the study region, building on the draft list developed by the National Marine Sanctuary Program.
3. NCCRSG members to participate in a work session on Wednesday, November 28, 2007 in San Rafael, CA.

B. Key next steps for I-Team staff

1. Package the work group draft options for MPA arrays and external proposals for review and evaluation by the SAT.
2. Forward the NCCRSG’s adopted “provisional north central coast regional goals and objectives” to the BRTF for review and approval.
3. Prepare memoranda to address:
 - Policy questions raised by NCCRSG (from section II.D.2 above)
 - Additional guidance on special closures
4. Review science questions and forward, as appropriate, to the SAT for consideration.
5. Work with NCCRSG subgroup to support further discussions on addressing disturbance of seabirds and marine mammals.
6. Prepare for and convene an NCCRSG work session on November 28, 2007 in San Rafael, CA.

Attachments Referenced

1. Adopted Provisional North Central Coast Regional Goals and Objectives (October 16, 2007)
2. NCCRSG process timeline (updated October 22, 2007)

California MLPA North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group
Provisional North Central Coast Regional Goals and Objectives
Adopted by NCCRSG, October 16, 2007

(The text below reflects revisions made at the NCCRSG's October 16, 2007 meeting.)

Introduction

The members of the North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (NCCRSG) agree that regional goals, objectives, and design and implementation considerations are all very important in the development of an effective system of marine protected areas (MPAs) that have stakeholder support. Regional goals are statements of what the regional MPAs are ultimately trying to achieve (Pomeroy et al. 2004)¹. The regional goals are largely taken directly from the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) itself. Regional objectives are more specific measurable statements of what MPAs may accomplish to attain a related goal (Pomeroy et al. 2004). The NCCRSG recognizes that MPAs are one among a suite of tools to manage marine resources.

Design considerations are additional factors that may help fulfill provisions of the MLPA related to facilitating enforcement, encouraging public involvement, and incorporating socio-economic considerations, while meeting the act's goals and guidelines. Design considerations will be applied as the location, category (reserve, park or conservation area), size and other characteristics of potential MPAs are being developed. Design considerations are cross cutting (they apply to all MPAs) and are not necessarily measurable. MPA alternatives developed by the NCCRSG should include analysis of how the proposal addresses both regional goals and objectives and design guidelines.²

¹ Pomeroy R.S., J.E. Parks, and L.M. Watson. 2004. How is your MPA doing? A Guidebook of Natural and Social Indicators for Evaluating Marine Protected Area Management Effectiveness. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK. xvi + 216 p. (Accessed 17 January 2004).
<http://effectivempa.noaa.gov/guidebook/guidebook.html>.

² John Kirlin Memo, August 22, 2005.

Provisional Regional Objectives

Goal 1. To protect the natural diversity and abundance³ of marine life, and the structure, function, and integrity of marine ecosystems.

1. Protect species diversity and abundance consistent with natural fluctuations by including and maintaining areas of high native species diversity and representative habitats.
2. Include areas with diverse habitat types in close proximity to each other.
[Propose moving to a design guideline as this is about efficiency of design not adaptive management]
3. Protect natural size and age structure and genetic diversity of populations in representative habitats.
4. Protect natural trophic structure and food webs in representative habitats.
5. Protect ecosystem structure, function, integrity and ecological processes to facilitate recovery of natural communities from disturbances both natural and human induced.

Goal 2. To help sustain, conserve, and protect marine life populations, including those of economic value, and rebuild those that are depleted.

1. Help protect or rebuild populations of rare, threatened, endangered, depressed, depleted, or overfished species, where identified, and the habitats and ecosystem functions upon which they rely.⁴
2. Sustain or increase reproduction by species most likely to benefit from MPAs through retention of large, mature individuals⁵.
3. Sustain or increase reproduction by species most likely to benefit from MPAs through protection of breeding, foraging, rearing or nursery areas.

³ *Natural diversity* is the species richness of a community or area when protected from, or not subjected to, human-induced change (drawn from Allaby 1998 and Kelleher 1992). *Natural abundance* is the total number of individuals in a population protected from, or not subjected to, human-induced change (adapted from Department 2004 and Kelleher 1992).

⁴ The terms “rare,” “threatened,” “endangered,” “depressed,” “depleted,” and “overfished” referenced here are designations in state and federal legislation, regulations, and fishery management plans (FMPs)—e.g., California Fish and Game Code, Marine Mammal Protection Act, Magnuson Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), California Nearshore FMP, Federal Groundfish FMP). *Rare*, *endangered*, and *threatened* are designations under the California Endangered Species Act. *Depleted* is a designation under the federal Marine Mammal Protection Act. *Depressed* means the condition of a marine fishery that exhibits declining fish population abundance levels below those consistent with maximum sustainable yield (California Fish and Game Code, Section 90.7). *Overfished* means a population that does not produce maximum sustainable yield on a continuing basis (MSA) and in the California Nearshore FMP and federal Groundfish FMP also means a population that falls below the threshold of 30% or 25%, successively, of the estimated unfished biomass

⁵ An increase in lifetime egg production will be an important quantitative measure of an improvement of reproduction.

4. Protect selected species and the habitats on which they depend while allowing the commercial and/or recreational harvest of migratory, highly mobile, or other species where appropriate through the use of state marine conservation areas and state marine parks.

Goal 3. To improve recreational, educational, and study opportunities provided by marine ecosystems that are subject to minimal human disturbances, and to manage these uses in a manner consistent with protecting biodiversity.

1. Ensure some MPAs are close to population centers, coastal access points, and/or research and education institutions and include areas of educational, recreational, and cultural use.
2. Sustain or enhance cultural, recreational, and educational experiences by ... *improving catch rates, high scenic value, lower congestion, or increased size or abundance of species.*
3. To enhance the likelihood of scientifically valid studies, replicate appropriate MPA designations, habitats or control areas (including areas open to fishing) to the extent possible.
4. Develop collaborative scientific monitoring and research projects evaluating MPAs that link with fisheries management information needs, classroom science curricula, volunteer dive programs, and fishermen, and identify participants.

Goal 4. To protect marine natural heritage, including protection of representative and unique marine life habitats in north central California waters, for their intrinsic value.

1. Include within MPAs the following habitat types: estuaries, ~~and the intertidal and zone at subtidal waters around the Farallon Islands, and subtidal waters (including the water column and benthic habitats) around the Farallon Islands. [are the deep water benthic and water column habitats unique as well and worthy of inclusion?]~~
2. Include and replicate to the extent possible [practicable], representatives of all marine habitats identified in the MLPA or the *California MLPA Master Plan for Marine Protected Areas* across a range of depths.

Goal 5. To ensure that north central California's MPAs have clearly defined objectives, effective management measures, and adequate enforcement, and are based on sound scientific guidelines.

1. Minimize negative socio-economic impacts and optimize positive socio-economic impacts for all users, to the extent possible, and if consistent with the Marine Life Protection Act and its goals and guidelines.
2. For all MPAs in the region involve interested parties to help; develop objectives, a long-term monitoring plan that includes standardized biological and socioeconomic

monitoring protocols, and a strategy for MPA evaluation, and ensure that each MPA objective is linked to one or more regional objectives.

3. To the extent possible, effectively use scientific guidelines in the *California MLPA Master Plan for Marine Protected Areas*.

Goal 6. To ensure that the north central coast's MPAs are designed and managed, to the extent possible, as a component of a statewide network.

1. Develop a process to inform adaptive management that includes stakeholder involvement for regional review and evaluation of management effectiveness to determine if regional MPAs are an effective component of a statewide network.
2. Develop a mechanism to coordinate with future MLPA regional stakeholder groups in other regions to ensure that the statewide MPA network meets the goals of the MLPA.

Provisional Regional Design and Implementation Considerations

Design Considerations

The NCCRSG recognizes several issues that should be considered in the design and evaluation of marine protected areas. Like the “Considerations in the Design of MPAs” that appears in the *California MLPA Master Plan for Marine Protected Areas*, these considerations may apply to all MPAs and MPA proposals regardless of the specific goals and objectives for that MPA. The design considerations below will be incorporated with the provisional goals and objectives and provided to the MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team, MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force, and California Fish and Game Commission. Design considerations with long-term monitoring components will be used in developing monitoring plans and to inform the adaptive management process.

1. In evaluating the siting of MPAs, considerations shall include the needs and interests of all users.
2. Recognize relevant portions of existing state and federal fishery management areas and regulations, to the extent possible, when designing new MPAs or modifying existing ones.
3. To the extent possible, site MPAs to prevent fishing effort shifts that would result in serial depletion.
4. When crafting MPA proposals, include considerations for design found in the Nearshore Fishery Management Plan⁶ and the draft Abalone Recovery and Management Plan.⁷
5. In developing MPA proposals, consider how existing state and federal programs address the goals and objectives of the MLPA and the north central coast region as well as how these proposals may coordinate with other programs.

⁶ Design considerations from Nearshore Fishery Management Plan:

1. Restrict take in any MPA [intended to meet the NFMP goals] so that the directed fishing or significant bycatch of the 19 NFMP species is prohibited.
2. Include some areas that have been productive fishing grounds for the 19 NFMP species in the past but are no longer heavily used by the fishery.
3. Include some areas known to enhance distribution or retain larvae of NFMP species
4. Consist of an area large enough to address biological characteristics such as movement patterns and home range. There is an expectation that some portion of NFMP stocks will spend the majority of their life cycle within the boundaries of the MPA.
5. Consist of areas that replicate various habitat types within each region including areas that exhibit representative productivity.

⁷ Design considerations from Abalone Recovery and Management Plan:

Proposed MPA sites should satisfy at least four of the following criteria.

1. Include within MPAs suitable rocky habitat containing abundant kelp and/or foliose algae
2. Insure presence of sufficient populations to facilitate reproduction.
3. Include within MPAs suitable nursery areas, in particular crustose coralline rock habitats in shallow waters that include microhabitats of moveable rock, rock crevices, urchin spine canopy, and kelp holdfasts.
4. Include within MPAs the protected lee of major headlands that may act as collection points for water and larvae.
5. Include MPAs large enough to include large numbers of abalone and for research regarding population dynamics.
6. Include MPAs that are accessible to researchers, enforcement personnel, and others with a legitimate interest in resource protection.

6. To the extent possible, site MPAs adjacent to terrestrial federal, state, county, or city parks, marine laboratories, or other "eyes on the water" to facilitate management, enforcement, and monitoring.
7. To the extent possible, site MPAs to facilitate use of volunteers to assist in monitoring and management.
8. To the extent possible, site MPAs to take advantage of existing long-term monitoring studies.
9. To the extent possible, design MPA boundaries that facilitate ease of public recognition and ease of enforcement.
10. Consider existing public coastal access points when designing MPAs.
11. MPA design should consider the benefits and drawbacks of siting MPAs near to or remote from public access.
12. Consider the potential impacts of climate change, community alteration, and distributional shifts in marine species when designing MPAs.
13. To the extent possible, preserve the diversity of recreational, educational, commercial, and cultural uses.

Implementation Considerations

Implementation considerations arise after the design of MPAs as the California Department of Fish and Game and any other responsible agencies implement decisions of the California Fish and Game Commission and, if appropriate, the California Park and Recreation Commission, with funding from the Legislature or other sources.

1. Improve public outreach related to MPAs through the use of docents, improved signage, and production of an educational brochure for north central coast MPAs.
2. When appropriate, phase the implementation of north central coast MPAs to ensure their effective management, monitoring, and enforcement.
3. Ensure adequate funding for monitoring, management, and enforcement is available for implementing new MPAs.
4. Develop regional management and enforcement measures, including cooperative enforcement agreements, adaptive management, and jurisdictional maps, which can be effectively used, adopted statewide, and periodically reviewed.
5. Incorporate volunteer monitoring and/or cooperative research, where appropriate.

California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative
Future Meetings Schedule
Revised October 22, 2007

Please check the MLPA website (www.dfg.ca.gov/mlpa) for the most current information, including meeting agendas and materials.

2007

November 13	SAT (Pacifica) Initial analysis of MPA arrays and proposals
November 19-20	BRTF (San Rafael) Initial review of MPA arrays and proposals
November 28	NCCRSG work group sessions (San Rafael) Begin revising initial MPA arrays
December 11-12	NCCRSG (Pacifica) Refine 1st draft MPA arrays; presentation of draft proposals

2008

January 8	SAT (San Francisco International Airport) Analysis of draft MPA proposals
January 23-24	BRTF (TBD) Review of draft MPA proposals
January ?	Workshops (Half Moon Bay, Bodega Bay, Gualala) Public input on draft MPA proposals
January ?	FGC (TBD) Initial feedback on draft MPA proposals
February 6-7	NCCRSG (San Rafael) Revise draft MPA proposals; develop preferred alternative
March 6	SAT (San Francisco International Airport) Analyze MPA proposal(s)
March 26-27	BRTF (San Rafael) Act on recommended proposal(s) and preferred alternative
May 14-15 (if needed)	NCCRSG (TBD) Comment on and propose refinements to BRTF recommended proposals and preferred alternative
June / July (if needed)	BRTF (TBD) Comment on and propose refinements to FGC preferred alternative

BRTF = MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force

SAT = MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team

NCCRSG = MLPA North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group

FGC = California Fish and Game Commission

**California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative
North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group
Proposed Agenda
(revised November 28, 2007)**

**Wednesday, November 28, 2007
10:00 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.**

**Four Points by Sheraton
1010 Northgate Drive
San Rafael, CA**

Members of the public are invited to attend the meeting in person or view and listen to the meeting via simultaneous webcasting on the Internet; an archived version will be available approximately two days after the meeting. Please visit the MLPA website at www.dfg.ca.gov/mlpa/meetings.asp for more information.

Meeting Objectives

- *Receive and discuss MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT) evaluations, Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF) guidance, and California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) feasibility analysis of work group “draft options for MPA arrays” and draft external MPA proposals*
- *Receive update on socioeconomic data collection*
- *Assess prospects for convergence on draft options within and across work groups*
- *Discuss future role of respective work groups relative to overall North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (NCCRSR) charge*
- *Begin discussing potential revisions to “draft options for MPA arrays” and draft external MPA proposals with an eye toward preparing “draft MPA proposals” at December 11-12, 2007 NCCRSR meeting*
- *Outline preparations for December NCCRSR meeting*

Meeting Agenda

10:00 AM	Welcome, introductions, and review of meeting objectives
10:15 AM	<div>Presentation of SAT evaluations, BRTF guidance, and DFG feasibility analysis of work group “draft options for MPA arrays” and draft “external” MPA proposals; clarifying questions<ul style="list-style-type: none">• SAT evaluations (Handouts A-F and R)• BRTF guidance (Handout G)• DFG feasibility analysis (Handouts H-I, Informational Item 4)• Update on Ecotrust data collection efforts (Handouts J-M)</div>

** This facility is accessible to persons with disabilities. To request reasonable accommodations for a disability, please contact California Relay Service (at least two days prior to the meeting) at 800.735.2929 (TT) or 800.735.2922 (voice) and ask them to contact the California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative at 916.654.1885.*

12:15 PM	Lunch (provided onsite for NCCRSR members)
1:00 PM	Public comment
1:15 PM	Receive staff presentation on areas of geographic overlap and discuss possible areas of convergence (Handouts N-Q)
2:00 PM	<p>Work group discussions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Briefly test potential for convergence (within and across work groups) • Discuss possible revisions to draft options for MPA arrays in light of SAT evaluations, BRTF guidance, and DFG analysis (discussion at conceptual level only) • Discuss (a) potential for individual work groups to converge around a single array, (b) specific suggestions for convergence, and (c) future role of work groups in developing "draft MPA proposals" • Assign members of each work group to look at specific geographies and come to the December 11-12 meeting prepared to brief the work group on options for moving forward
4:00 PM	<p>Recap and next steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss future role of respective work groups relative to the overall charge of the NCCRSR; take stock of progress and prospects of working toward convergence • Review preparations for December NCCRSR meeting
4:30 PM	Adjourn

Handouts

- A. Draft SAT report on the methodologies for evaluating draft options for MPA arrays and draft external MPA proposals
- B. PowerPoint presentation: *Science Guidelines and Draft Options for MPA Arrays and Draft External MPA Proposals Evaluations – North Central Coast Study Region* (Dr. Mark Carr, Master Plan Science Advisory Team)
- C. Dr. Mark Carr PowerPoint presentation to the MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team on November 13, 2007
- D. PowerPoint presentation: *Preliminary Size and Spacing Evaluations – North Central Coast Proposals* (Dr. Steve Gaines, Master Plan Science Advisory Team)
- E. PowerPoint presentation: *Draft Options for MPA Arrays and Draft External MPA Proposal Evaluations – Potential Fishery Impacts in the North Central Coast Study Region* (Dr. Astrid Schulz, Master Plan Science Advisory Team)
- F. Memorandum from Astrid Scholz, Ecotrust, to the MLPA Initiative dated 26 November 2007 and *Summary of potential impacts of the October 2007 MPA proposals on commercial fisheries in the MLPA North Central Coast Study Region* (Revised Final, 26 November 2007)
- G. Ken Wiseman memo regarding feedback received from the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force
- H. California Department of Fish and Game feasibility analysis of the draft options for MPA arrays and draft external MPA proposals
- I. California Department of Fish and Game memo regarding the use of special closures

- J. PowerPoint presentation: *Commercial Fishing Grounds and Socioeconomic Data Collection* (Dr. Sarah Kruse, Ecotrust)
- K. *Commercial Fishing Grounds Datasets by Landing Port* (November 28, 2007)
- L. PowerPoint presentation: *Recreational Fishing Grounds and Values Data Collection* (Dr. Sarah Kruse, Ecotrust)
- M. *Recreational Fishing Grounds Datasets* (November 28, 2007) and *Draft Recreational Fishing Factors Survey* (November 28, 2007)
- N. PowerPoint presentation: *Developing and Refining Draft MPA Proposals for the North Central Coast* (Dr. Mary Gleason)
- O. Areas of overlap among NCCRSG work group draft options for MPA arrays and areas of overlap among draft options and draft external MPA proposals
- P. One page overview maps for each draft option for MPA arrays and each draft external MPA proposal (EA, EB, JA, JB, TA, TB, External A, External B, External C, External D)
- Q. Staff summaries of area and habitats for each draft option for MPA arrays and each draft external MPA proposal
- R. *MLPA SAT Preliminary Description of Habitat Protection by Evaluation Subregions within Draft Options for MPA Arrays and Draft External MPA Proposals* (revised November 28, 2007)

Informational Items

- 1. MLPA SAT's *Responses to Science Questions Posed by the NCCRSG at its July 10-11, 2007 Meeting* (revised November 20, 2007)
- 2. MLPA SAT's *Responses to Science Questions Posed by Santi Roberts/Oceana in a Letter Dated September 10, 2007* (revised November 20, 2007)
- 3. MLPA staff and their roles in the MLPA Initiative (revised August 31, 2007)
- 4. PowerPoint presentation (not distributed in print form): *NCCSR Initial Feasibility Analysis* (Susan Ashcraft, California Department of Fish and Game)

Key Outcomes Memorandum

Date: December 14, 2007

To: Members, MLPA North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (NCCRSG)

From: Scott McCreary and Eric Poncelet, CONCUR, Inc.

Re: Key Outcomes Memorandum – November 28, 2007 NCCRSG Meeting

cc: MLPA Initiative Staff and California Department of Fish and Game MLPA Staff

Executive Summary – Key Outcomes

On November 28, 2007, the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) Initiative North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (NCCRSG) participated in its fifth meeting, in San Rafael, CA. **Key outcomes** from the meeting are as follows:

- The NCCRSG received and discussed the Science Advisory Team (SAT) evaluation, MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF) guidance, and California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) feasibility analysis on the set of 10 work group “draft options for MPA arrays” and “external MPA proposals”
- The NCCRSG received reports on the status of Ecotrust’s socioeconomic data collection. Final commercial data and draft recreational data should be available for the December NCCRSG meeting.
- NCCRSG members discussed possible approaches for moving toward convergence and winnowing the number of arrays to be advanced by the NCCRSG for the next round of evaluation. This included discussion of possible approaches for addressing the external MPA proposals.
- Each work group established a game plan to analyze the SAT, BRTF, and DFG guidance in advance of the December NCCRSG meeting.
- The NCCRSG received comment from members of the public.

Key **next steps** include (other next steps are listed in section III below):

- Work group members to work both individually and in sub-groups to prepare for the December NCCRSG meeting. Preparations will include reviewing and digesting the SAT evaluation, BRTF guidance, and DFG feasibility analysis, and developing suggested array revisions for specific geographic areas.
- Turquoise and emerald work group members to each schedule prep meetings to discuss SAT, BRTF, and DFG feedback and possible array revisions. Prep meetings to take place in advance of the December 11-12, 2007 NCCRSG meeting.
- I-Team to support work group preparations for the December NCCRSG meeting. This includes providing staff support for work group prep meetings and making available socioeconomic data.

I. Meeting Participants and Materials

Thirty-six NCCRSR primary and alternate members participated in the November 28, 2007 meeting.

MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team members participating in the meeting included Mark Carr and Steven Morgan.

MLPA Initiative and California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) staff—collectively known as the “I-Team”—staffed the meeting.

Meeting materials, including copies of the PowerPoint presentations, may be found on the MLPA website at: http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mlpa/meeting_112807.asp

II. Key Outcomes

A. NCCRSR received feedback and guidance on work group “draft options for MPA arrays” and external MPA proposals

1. SAT evaluation

Dr. Mark Carr presented the SAT’s evaluation of the six work group “draft options for MPA arrays” and four “external MPA proposals” with regard to the following criteria: habitat representation, MPA size and spacing, and replication. In his presentation, Dr. Carr explained the level of protection system developed by the SAT for evaluating the different arrays. Key points made include the following:

- Soft bottom habitats were less represented in high protection MPAs than rocky bottom habitats.
- Several MPAs received lower protection level designations because of insufficient specificity from NCCRSR work groups about allowed uses in the MPAs (e.g., salmon gear, fate of existing mariculture leases).
- Some habitats were better represented in the southern part of the study region (e.g., tidal flats, eelgrass, estuaries, shallow soft bottom), while others were better represented in the north (e.g., deep and shallow rocky reef).
- Few “draft options for MPA arrays” and “proposals external to the work groups” meet size, spacing, or replication guidelines at the very high and high levels of protection; many more arrays meet these guidelines at the moderately-high level of protection.
- The SAT could not discern whether array authors realized the focus for evaluation of spacing and replication is habitats, not MPAs.
- Modifications that meet size guidelines can increase the number of habitats meeting the spacing and replication guidelines.

Dr. Sarah Kruse (Ecotrust) presented Ecotrust’s socioeconomic analysis of the ten draft internal work group and external MPA arrays. The analysis examined the impacts of each draft array on a variety of fisheries. These impacts were defined by the percentage of fishing grounds and value affected for both the north central coast study area and in

total. Dr. Kruse noted that the ten draft arrays varied considerably in their net economic impact on the study region, ranging from just under 2% to over 14%.

2. BRTF guidance

Ken Wiseman (I-Team staff) summarized the guidance provided from the BRTF at its November 19-20, 2007 meeting. Key BRTF guidance included the following:

- The BRTF would like to see no more than 3-5 draft MPA proposals forwarded from the December NCCRSG meeting for the next round of SAT analysis.
- The next round of “draft MPA proposals” should all meet the SAT and DFG guidelines, while taking into account socioeconomic considerations and impacts.
- The focus of the MLPA is on marine ecosystems, not property ownership.

3. DFG feasibility analysis

Susan Ashcraft (I-Team staff) presented DFG’s analysis of the “draft options for MPA arrays” and “external MPA proposals” relative to DFG’s feasibility criteria. She reminded NCCRSG members that DFG is responsible for evaluating all of the MPA proposals that are eventually forwarded to the Fish and Game Commission for decision with respect to these criteria. She provided the following additional guidance to NCCRSG members:

- If NCCRSG members choose in certain cases not to meet DFG’s feasibility criteria, NCCRSG members should clearly document the reasons for not doing so. This will help inform future SAT and BRTF evaluations.
- NCCRSG members should be judicious when considering special closures. Special closures need to be enforceable. NCCRSG members also need to be specific in their proposals about which species are being protected and for what purposes.

4. NCCRSG comments and additional I-Team staff guidance

NCCRSG members posed clarifying questions regarding the SAT, BRTF, and DFG feedback, and received additional guidance from SAT members and I-Team staff. Key points included:

- NCCRSG members pointed out several areas where little data exist. For example, DFG landings data include little information on incidental catch, they do not take into account multi-species targets, and they do not distinguish between live and dead release. I-Team staff noted that these are all areas where staff and SAT members are interested to work with stakeholders to incorporate stakeholder information.
- NCCRSG members asked for guidance on the relative weight and importance of the respective design criteria (e.g., SAT, DFG feasibility, socioeconomic impact, etc.). I-Team staff responded that the SAT size and spacing guidelines and DFG feasibility guidance are generally the most important, but clarified that the most pertinent criteria may depend on the actual objectives of individual MPAs. For example, SAT size/spacing guidelines are less pertinent for MPAs having the goal 3 objectives of improving recreational, study, or educational experiences.
- I-Team staff clarified that replication of habitats within MPAs, as described in the MLPA, needs to be addressed at a biogeographic scale. As such, replication in the

north central coast study region should be additive with the central coast study region. However, given the diversity of ecosystems within the North Central Coast study region, stakeholders may also want to consider replication within the study region, such as for purposes of scientific study (MLPA Goal 3).

B. NCCRS received status report on socioeconomic analyses

Dr. Sarah Kruse (Ecotrust) provided an update on the status of Ecotrust's socioeconomic data collection on commercial and recreational fishing.

1. **Commercial fishing data.** The maps presented to the NCCRS at the October NCCRS meeting have been revised and can be displayed by DFG and I-Team GIS staff.. The maps for ports now include fishermen who landed at those ports rather than just their home ports.
2. **Recreational fishing data.** Draft spatial and value data have been compiled and draft maps have been prepared. The draft maps can be displayed by DFG and I-Team GIS staff.. Data still need to be validated. The goal is to have final maps ready for the December NCCRS meeting.

DFG staff noted that the commercial and recreational maps would be made available for stakeholder viewing at designative DFG offices in advance of the December NCCRS meeting.

C. NCCRS members discussed possible approaches for winnowing the number of arrays to be advanced by the NCCRS for the next round of evaluation

NCCRS members engaged in plenary and work group deliberations to discuss steps for winnowing the number of arrays to be reviewed in the next round of evaluation. Key outcomes from this discussion include:

- **NCCRS members expressed broad support for additional opportunities to work in the work group setting.** NCCRS members expressed a general desire to give the respective work groups more time to address the SAT/BRTF/DFG guidance and to try to come to convergence around single arrays.
- **NCCRS members recognized the need for more plenary deliberation.** NCCRS members expressed the general sentiment that the work groups have worked well so far, but that additional plenary discussions and feedback (i.e., across work groups) are needed at this stage. Several participants suggested that plenary discussion follow work group deliberations at the December NCCRS meeting.
- **NCCRS members suggested possible approaches for addressing the external MPA proposals.** Options identified included:
 - Each work group could be asked to integrate the external proposals into the next round of work group arrays.
 - Each work group could be assigned one or more external proposals and charged with winnowing their two internal proposals plus the one or more assigned external proposals down to a single array for evaluation in the next round.

- NCCRSR could use straw voting to winnow the number of external proposals to be carried to the next round of SAT/BRTF/DFG evaluation.
- **NCCRSR members identified possible process approaches for arriving at 3-5 draft MPA proposals by end of December meeting.** Potential Key approaches discussed included the following (note: NCCRSR members did not necessarily see these as mutually exclusive):
 - Work group convergence: Work groups would each strive to converge around a single array, resulting ideally in 3 draft MPA proposals. This could be informed by supplemental plenary discussions. Alternatively, each work group could send a couple of members to the other work groups to provide input.
 - Work for convergence in plenary: NCCRSR members would use plenary sessions to look across all draft arrays, find “partners”, make tradeoffs, and come up with a new set of proposals that would emerge out of these discussions.
 - Build on array similarities, and converge in the work group setting: Similar arrays from within the group of 10 draft options and external proposals would be grouped together. Grouped arrays would be assigned to individual work groups, which would be tasked with converging among the like arrays. Four groupings, for example, would result in four draft MPA proposals.
 - Assemble arrays out of options identified for key geographic areas: Cross-work group teams would first identify 3-4 MPA options for each of the main geographic areas. The plenary would then assemble these into 3-4 arrays (some more restrictive than others).

Note: NCCRSR members did not agree on a preferred process approach for producing 3-5 “draft MPA proposals” by the end of the December meeting.

- **Each work group established a game plan to analyze the SAT/BRTF/DFG feedback and prepare for the December meeting.** The turquoise and emerald groups organized sub-groups to address this feedback for the different SAT-identified sub-regions (north of Point Reyes, south of Point Reyes, and the Farallon Islands). The jade group decided that its members would conduct this analysis individually. All work groups recognized the need to come to the December meeting prepared with specific recommended changes in hand.

D. Public comment

The meeting included a designated public comment period. About 25 members of the public attended the meeting. Eight members of the public provided comments. Key comments included the following advice to NCCRSR members:

- Take local landowner stewardship actions and the current inaccessibility of much of the north central coast into account when designing MPAs. Some coastal residents expressed the sentiment that local private property owners practicing good stewardship may be more effective than a State-run program.
- Take socioeconomic impacts on local communities into account in the MPA design process.
- Continue to improve outreach to the public regarding MLPA, as much of the public is still unaware of the Act and its potential implications for local inhabitants and resource users.
- Address the potential for displaced fishing effort in the design of MPAs.

- Address water pollution issues, as these may be a bigger threat to marine resources along the north central coast than fishing.
- Ensure that the public has access to the same data being received by the NCCRSG, and that the public receives this information in a timely manner.

E. Next NCCRSG meeting

The next NCCRSG meeting is scheduled for December 11-12, 2007 in Pacifica, CA. Key objectives for the December meeting are to:

- Receive informational presentations: tribal use data, goal 3 evaluation, revised “external” MPA proposals
- Work in extended work group and plenary formats to respond to SAT, BRTF, and DFG feedback on arrays/proposals
- Use a mix of deliberation and straw voting to arrive at 3-5 “draft MPA proposals” for the next round of SAT and BRTF review and evaluation

III. Recap of Next Steps

A. Key next steps for NCCRSG members

1. Work group members to work both individually and in sub-groups focused on specific geographic regions to prepare for the December NCCRSG meeting by reviewing the SAT/BRTF/DFG guidance and developing suggested array revisions.
2. Turquoise and emerald work group members to schedule respective prep meetings in advance of the December 11-12, 2007 NCCRSG meeting to discuss SAT/BRTF/DFG feedback and possible array revisions.

B. Key next steps for I-Team staff

1. Support work group efforts to prepare for the December NCCRSG meeting, including the possible staffing of work group in-person prep meetings.
2. Prepare for the December NCCRSG meeting in Pacifica, CA.

California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative
North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (NCCRSG)
Proposed Meeting Agenda
(revised December 12, 2007)

Tuesday, December 11, 2007 at 10:00 a.m.
Wednesday, December 12, 2007 at 8:00 a.m.

Best Western Lighthouse Hotel *
105 Rockaway Beach Avenue
Pacifica, CA 94044

Members of the public are invited to attend the meeting in person or view and listen to the meeting via simultaneous webcasting on the Internet; an archived version will be available approximately two days after the meeting. Please visit the MLPA website at www.dfg.ca.gov/mlpa/meetings.asp for more information.

Meeting Objectives

- *Receive updates or informational presentations on revised 2008 schedule, MLPA Goal 3 analysis, tribal use data, Special Closures, preliminary results of a Marxan analysis by UC Santa Barbara graduate students, and revised "external" MPA proposals.*
- *Work in extended work group and plenary formats to respond to MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT), Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF), and California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) feedback on draft MPA arrays/proposals*
- *Select no more than five draft MPA proposals for the next round of review and evaluation*
- *Adopt new ground rule to focus North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (NCCRSG) email communications*

Meeting Agenda: Tuesday, December 11, 2007

9:30 a.m.		<i>Arrival, refreshments and greetings</i>
10:00 a.m.	1.	Welcome, agenda review, and brief introductions
10:20 a.m.	2.	Review, discuss, and adopt ground rule on NCCRSG email communications (Attachment 1)
10:30 a.m.	3.	Updates and briefings <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Update on 2008 MLPA schedule revisions (Attachment 2)• Update on socioeconomic data• Briefing on November 29 SAT meeting (Handout A)• Update on staff summary of SAT analyses (Attachment 3)
10:45 a.m.	4.	Receive informational presentations <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Staff MLPA Goal 3 evaluation (Attachment 4 and Handout B)• Tribal uses (Handouts C-D)• Special closures (Handout E)• Preliminary results of "exploratory" Marxan analysis (Handouts F-G)

** This facility is accessible to persons with disabilities. To request reasonable accommodations for a disability, please contact California Relay Service (at least two days prior to the meeting) at 800.735.2929 (TT) or 800.735.2922 (voice) and ask them to contact the California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative at 916.654.1885.*

Meeting Agenda: Tuesday, December 11, 2007 (continued)

11:40 a.m.	5.	Receive presentations on revised draft external MPA proposals (Handout H, December 6, 2008 versions)
12:30 p.m.		<i>Lunch (provided onsite for NCCRSG members)</i>
1:15 p.m.	6.	Public comment
1:45 p.m.	7.	Work group sessions to develop draft MPA proposals (Attachment 5)
6:00 p.m.		<i>Break (dinner provided onsite for NCCRSG members)</i>
7:00 p.m.	8.	Review of work group draft MPA proposals (“poster session” style)
8:30 p.m.		<i>Break for evening</i>

Meeting Agenda: Wednesday, December 12, 2007

7:00 a.m.		<i>Breakfast provided for NCCRSG members</i>
8:00 a.m.	9.	Work group sessions to incorporate input from plenary review and continue developing draft MPA proposals
11:15 a.m.	10.	Work groups and staff to confirm text and shapes of draft MPA proposals
11:45 a.m.		<i>Lunch (provided onsite for NCCRSG members)</i>
12:30 p.m.	11.	Public comment
1:00 p.m.	12.	Work groups present “draft MPA proposals” to plenary; discussion
2:15 p.m.	13.	Conduct straw voting, if needed, to winnow number of “draft MPA proposals” to no more than five for the next round of evaluations and review
3:30 p.m.	14.	Present results of straw voting, if any, and discuss next steps
3:45 p.m.	15.	Wrap up and review steps to prepare for subsequent evaluations and reviews, and the next NCCRSG meeting (March 18-19, 2008)
4:00 p.m.		<i>Adjourn</i>

Attachments

1. Draft ground rule on NCCRSG email communications
2. Revised 2008 MLPA schedule
3. Staff memo and revised staff summary of SAT analysis
4. Draft staff evaluation of MLPA Goal 3
5. Examples of MPA regulatory language and “objectives” from the MLPA central coast process

Handouts

- A. Draft responses to August 22-23, 2007 and October 16-17, 2007 science questions

- B. PowerPoint presentation: *Draft Goal 3 Evaluation of Draft MPA Arrays and Draft External Proposals* (Dr. Mary Gleason)
- C. PowerPoint presentation: *Summary of Tribal Data Collection Efforts* (Dr. Mary Gleason)
- D. Preliminary maps of some Native American tribal use areas
- E. *Seasonality of Sensitive Life Stages of Birds and Mammals Most Likely to Benefit from Marine Protected Areas* (revised December 10, 2007)
- F. PowerPoint presentation: *UCSB Bren Student Group Marxan Analysis* (Dr. Mary Gleason)
- G. Marxan "exploratory" analysis – maps and explanatory document
- H. Templates and maps for revised draft external MPA proposals A, B and C

Key Outcomes Memorandum

Date: December 21, 2007

To: Members, MLPA North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (NCCRSG)

From: Scott McCreary and Eric Poncelet, CONCUR, Inc.

Re: Key Outcomes Memorandum – December 11-12, 2007 NCCRSG Meeting

cc: MLPA Initiative Staff and California Department of Fish and Game MLPA Staff

Executive Summary – Key Outcomes

On December 11-12, 2007, the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) Initiative North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (NCCRSG) participated in its sixth meeting, in Pacifica, CA. **Key outcomes** from the meeting are as follows:

- NCCRSG members succeeded in arriving at four draft marine protected area (MPA) proposals, using a mixed work group and plenary (“poster session”) format. All four products will be referred to as “draft MPA proposals” and will proceed to the next round of evaluation. Two of the four draft MPA proposals reflected convergence within two of the NCCRSG work groups. The other two draft MPA proposals reflected convergence between work group draft options and revised draft external MPA arrays (“B” and “C”).
- NCCRSG members identified leads for each of the draft MPA proposals to help coordinate future work on those proposals.
- Proponents of draft external MPA proposal “A” had an opportunity to meet with all work groups and suggest ways to integrate their interests.
- MLPA Initiative staff recognized extenuating circumstances related to the San Francisco Bay oil spill and associated impacts on fishing, which proponents of draft external MPA proposal “A” said had compromised their ability to submit a revised draft proposal that responded to 1st evaluation round feedback by the December 5, 2007 due date. Draft proposal “A” proponents were given a time extension until January 2, 2008 for their next step. They may choose to either: (a) make substantial revisions to their external MPA proposal to take into account the goals of the MLPA and various forms of guidance, or (b) withdraw their draft external proposal in light of the many ideas already integrated in the four draft MPA proposals developed at the December 11-12, 2007 NCCRSG meeting.
- NCCRSG members received informational briefings to inform their deliberations on draft MPA proposals. Key information presented included MLPA staff’s MLPA Goal 3 evaluation, preliminary tribal use data, preliminary results from an “exploratory” Marxan analysis, and presentations on the revised draft external MPA proposals.
- NCCRSG members established a process to address “special closures” as they relate to MPA proposals. An NCCRSG subgroup will convene on January 9, 2008 to address specific special closures identified by the work groups.
- NCCRSG members discussed and adopted a new ground rule on email communications and use of list servers (see attached).
- The NCCRSG received comments from members of the public.

I. Meeting Participants and Materials

Twenty-four NCCRSG primary members and eighteen alternate members participated in the December 11-12, 2007 meeting.

MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT) members participating in the meeting included Sarah Allen. Meg Caldwell participated on behalf of the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF).

MLPA Initiative and California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) staff—collectively known as the “I-Team”—staffed the meeting.

Meeting materials, including copies of the PowerPoint presentations, may be found on the MLPA website at: http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mlpa/meeting_121107.asp

II. Key Outcomes

A. NCCRSG members worked in work group and plenary (“poster session”) formats to create four “draft MPA proposals” for the second round of evaluation

1. I-Team staff outlined a process to reduce the number of MPA arrays for the second round of evaluation.

In response to the BRTF’s request that the NCCRSG forward no more than five draft proposals for the second round of evaluation, I-Team staff outlined three main ways by which work groups could “converge”:

- Work groups could unify their “draft options for MPA arrays” (i.e., arrays A and B)
- Draft options from different work groups could be combined into a unified proposal
- Work group draft options and external MPA proposals could be combined.

In addition, the I-Team noted that the number of draft arrays could be winnowed if a proponent of an external proposal opted to treat their proposal as a source of ideas for other proposals, but not develop it as a full draft proposal.

I-Team staff indicated that if work groups were not able to converge as described above, any non-converged arrays would enter a pool along with the revised draft external MPA proposals (A, B, and C). If needed, straw voting would be used to determine which of the arrays from the pool would accompany the “converged” arrays to the next round of evaluation.

2. NCCRSG work groups achieved convergence in a variety of ways

All three “gem” work groups achieved convergence, albeit in different ways. All of the work group deliberations were informed by SAT/BRTF/DFG feedback on work group draft options for MPA arrays and draft external MPA proposals, recent revisions to all of these arrays, and public comment.

- a. Emerald: The emerald work group developed a single MPA array (entitled emerald C) that was supported by the entire work group for analysis in the next round of evaluation.
- b. Jade: The jade work group divided into two subgroups, which each converged around an array. Jade draft option for MPA array A was combined with revised external proposal C (now entitled jade C), and jade draft option for MPA array B was combined with revised external proposal B (now entitled jade D). Jade work group members received approval from the authors of external proposals B and C to converge with the jade draft options.
- c. Turquoise: The turquoise work group developed a single MPA array (entitled turquoise C) that was supported by the entire work group for analysis in the next round of evaluation.

Each of these four arrays will be called a “draft MPA proposal” and assigned a new number by the I-Team for use in future evaluations.

3. NCCRSR members identified leads for each of the converged “draft MPA proposals” to help coordinate future work

Draft MPA proposal leads are as follows:

- Emerald C: Rick Johnson, Paul Pierce, Samantha Murray
- Jade C: Karen Garrison, Lance Morgan, Jim Hobbs
- Jade D: Ben Sleeter, Russell Herring
- Turquoise C: Ed Tavasieff, Sean White

Key responsibilities for the draft proposal leads may include: coordinate completion of the goals and objectives for the current round of proposals, provide quality control review of the next round of maps being developed by the I-Team, and participate in panel discussions at future SAT and BRTF meetings.

B. Draft external MPA proposal “A” given additional time for revision

NCCRSR members discussed whether draft external MPA proposal A should also be forwarded for the next round of review. Some members pointed out that, unlike the four converged proposals, draft external proposal A had not been revised since it was first submitted in early October and, as such, did not take into account recent SAT, BRTF, and DFG feedback. Others pointed out that the revision period had coincided with a very busy period for fishermen (crab especially), especially given the impacts of the San Francisco Bay oil spill. Still others noted that proponents of external proposal A had been given extensive opportunities during the December 11-12 NCCRSR meeting to present and discuss the interests and ideas reflected in draft external proposal A.

Dave Yarger, one of the authors of draft external proposal A, requested that his stakeholder constituents be given additional time to revise external proposal A so it could be analyzed along with the four “draft MPA proposals” in the next round of evaluation. He indicated that his constituents had intended to revise the proposal in advance of the December 5, 2007 cutoff date, but that they ran out of time due to the extenuating circumstances affecting the entire commercial fishing fleet in Bodega Bay.

I-Team staff deliberated on NCCRSG comments and requested that Dave Yarger meet with his constituents to either:

- Modify external proposal A significantly to respond to the goals of the MLPA and SAT and DFG feasibility guidelines. The due date for the revised external MPA proposal A would be January 2, 2008. This would leave enough time for I-Team staff to prepare the revised proposal for SAT evaluation. Unlike the draft MPA proposals described above, this proposal would be forwarded as a “revised external MPA proposal”; or
- Withdraw external proposal A, in light of the substantial integration of concepts into the other draft MPA proposals.

I-Team staff offered to provide support in the revision effort. I-Team staff also advised the authors of external proposal A to further inform their revisions by reviewing the four “draft MPA proposals” produced at the December 11-12, 2007 NCCRSG meeting and consulting with other NCCRSG members from all interest groups.

C. NCCRSG members received informational briefings to inform their deliberations on draft MPA proposals

I-Team staff provided NCCRSG members with briefings to inform NCCRSG deliberations on draft MPA proposals. Key information presented included the following:

- Staff MLPA Goal #3 evaluation (of round 1 draft options for MPA arrays and draft external MPA proposals)
- Preliminary data on tribal uses (note: the maps contained only non-confidential data)
- Preliminary results of an “exploratory” Marxan analysis (note: this analysis was focused only on optimization of habitat conservation and commercial fishing goals; later analyses may include additional goals, such as commercial fishing, tribal uses, minimizing seabird and marine mammal disturbances, etc.).
- Presentation of revised draft external MPA proposals B and C. These external proposals had been revised to address feedback from recent SAT, BRTF, and DFG feasibility evaluations as well as other public input.

D. NCCRSG members established a process to address special closures

NCCRSG members discussed possible approaches for addressing the use of special closures as a supplement to MPAs. NCCRSG members agreed with I-Team staff that the best approach would be to convene a NCCRSG subgroup that would meet in person following the December 11-12, 2007 meeting. The goal of the meeting is to develop a specific suite of recommendations/options to provide to the SAT working group to analyze in time for the January 23, 2008 SAT meeting. To do this, the subgroup will look at the recommendations coming from the Sanctuary/interagency group for bird protection and other bird/mammal areas that work groups had identified in their draft arrays. The outcomes of this subgroup meeting would inform ongoing NCCRSG efforts to develop “final MPA proposals” by the end of the March 18-19, 2008 NCCRSG meeting.

The following NCCRSG members volunteered to participate in the special closures subgroup: Ed Tavasieff, Francesca Koe, Bob Wilson, Irina Kogan, Karen Reyna, John Mellor, Jay Yokomizo, Santi Roberts, Tom Baty, Tom Mattusch, and Cassidy Teufel. Note:

Two CPFV captains who are experienced in the topic will also be consulted with, and Farallon National Wildlife Refuge Manager Joelle Buffa and California Coastal Monument Manager Rick Hanks have also been invited to attend. SAT members Sarah Allen and Gerry McChesney will participate as well.

NCCRSG members offered the following additional guidance to the special closures subgroup:

- The special closures subgroup should address the feasibility and applicability of special closures at designated areas identified by the new “draft MPA proposals.”
- The subgroup should coordinate closely with the SAT working group focused on seabird and marine mammal disturbances. Potential special closures should be evaluated by the SAT for their contribution to the protection of seabird and marine mammal colonies/rookeries. The SAT will analyze the proportion of each species captured within MPAs and proposed special closures for each proposal. Proposed MPAs will be reviewed for which ones contribute to the protection of seabirds and marine mammals and those will be included in the analysis. This evaluation will be based on a subregional scale.
- The subgroup should involve other implicated agencies in the discussions (e.g., U.S. Coast Guard, U.S. Bureau of Land Management, CA Coastal Commission)

E. NCCRSG members adopted revised ground rules

NCCRSG members reviewed, discussed, and adopted a new ground rule on email communications. The adopted ground rule highlights the aim of keeping messages concise and related to the core charge of the NCCRSG. The full text of the adopted ground rule appears under the header “Email Communications and the Use of List Servers” in the attached revised ground rules, dated December 11, 2007 (Attachment 1).

F. Public comment

The meeting included two designated public comment periods. Over 50 members of the public attended the meeting, about 30 of whom provided comments. Key comments included the following advice to NCCRSG members:

- Several members of the public requested that the NCCRSG closely examine the possible socioeconomic impacts associated with proposed MPAs throughout the study region. Comments included:
 - The NCCRSG should consider leaving some of the area north of Anchor Bay open to fishing, as fishing is important to the economy of the area.
 - MPAs around the Farallon Islands may have a negative impact on ecotourism focused on the Islands (along with associated educational benefits). Special permits may be a way to manage impacts without restricting access.
 - NCCRSG members should consider existing restoration activities and the importance of fishing in Pescadero Creek before siting it as a no-take state marine reserve.
 - Commercial fishing is already depressed along the north central coast. Further restrictions caused by MPAs could further diminish the viability of the industry.

- NCCRSG members should consider existing preservation and restoration efforts in the MPA planning process.
- Discussions on special closures should include input from other interested organizations, such as the Audubon Society and the California Waterfowl Association.
- Logbook records from some boats show that incidental catch associated with salmon trolling has been low over the past 4-6 years.
- When considering siting MPAs near the Farallon Islands, NCCRSG members should recognize that the State's Abalone Recovery and Management Plan identifies the Farallon Islands as a possible area for reopening an experimental commercial abalone fishery.
- MPAs should not be used to address issues better dealt with through existing fishery management measures. Additionally, MPAs will not protect against water quality threats.
- NCCRSG members should consider the interests of coastal private property owners.
- There is strong local support for expanding the existing Fitzgerald Marine Reserve.
- State marine reserves are an important tool for protecting marine ecosystems.

Members of the public also recognized and expressed gratitude that some earlier public comments have been incorporated into the revised versions of external MPA proposals B and C.

G. Next NCCRSG meeting

The next NCCRSG meeting is scheduled for March 18-19, 2007. The I-Team will likely schedule work sessions in February and/or early March for NCCRSG members to: receive feedback from the upcoming round of SAT, BRTF and DFG evaluations, discuss possible revisions to the draft MPA proposals, and continue working toward convergence. Key objectives for the March meeting will be to:

- Revise the draft MPA proposals to incorporate SAT, BRTF and DFG feedback from the second round of evaluation
- Develop "final MPA proposals" to forward to the SAT, BRTF and DFG for the third and final round of review and evaluation.

III. Recap of Next Steps

A. Key next steps for NCCRSG members

1. Work group leads to further develop goals and objectives for each of the four draft MPA proposals and forward these to I-Team staff by COB, December 19, 2007.
2. Authors of draft external MPA proposal A to determine their next step, which could be either (a) submission of a substantially revised proposal to I-Team staff by January 2, 2008, or (b) withdrawal of their proposal.
3. Special closures subgroup to meet in person on January 9, 2008 from 2-4 PM to address special closure issues. This meeting will take place at the SF offices of the Gulf of the Farallons National Marine Sanctuary.

B. Key next steps for I-Team staff

1. Update the existing ground rules accordingly and transmit the revised version to NCCRSG members (see attached).
2. Work with special closures subgroup to convene an in-person meeting on January 9, 2008 from 12-4 PM. This meeting will take place at the SF offices of the Gulf of the Farallons National Marine Sanctuary.
3. Prepare the four draft MPA proposals (and the revised external proposal A, if submitted) for SAT evaluation.

C. Other upcoming meeting dates

January 8, 2008:	SAT meeting to discuss parallel processes (modeling)
January 23, 2008:	SAT meeting to evaluate current round of MPA proposals
February 4-6, 2008:	Public workshops
February 13-14, 2008:	BRTF meeting to evaluate current round of MPA proposals
March 18-19, 2008	NCCRSG meeting to develop "final MPA proposals"
April 3, 2008:	SAT meeting to evaluate "final MPA proposals"
April 22-23, 2008:	BRTF meeting to evaluate "final MPA proposals" and prepare a recommended alternative

ATTACHMENTS

1. Revised Ground Rules (dated December 11, 2007)

Revised Ground Rules

North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group

(Adopted by MLPA NCCRSG, May 22, 2007; Revised December 11, 2007)

The following ground rules have been informed by confidential interviews conducted with a cross section of the nominees for the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (NCCRSG), including nearly all of the appointed north central coast (NCC) primary members, as well as CONCUR's professional experience. These ground rules are intended to foster and reinforce constructive interaction and deliberation among NCCRSG members; they emphasize clear communication, trust building, respect for divergent views, creative thinking, collaborative problem solving, and the pursuit of mutual gains. The NCCRSG may decide to reconsider and revise these ground rules if they appear not to be serving the NCCRSG process.

Representation

- **NCCRSG recruitment and selection.** NCCRSG members have been appointed by the director of the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) and the chair of the MLPA Initiative Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF). Taken together, appointments were made to achieve a diversity of stakeholder perspectives, expertise, and geography. NCCRSG members were appointed based on their match with the following selection criteria:
 - Able to bring first hand knowledge and perspective to bear on the marine resources of the MLPA North Central Coast Study Region
 - Able to balance a north central coast regional perspective with localized knowledge
 - Willing to express fundamental interests (as opposed to fixed positions) and to clearly convey the interests of one or more important stakeholder groups
 - Capable of working collaboratively, seeking to integrate the interests of a broad range of constituencies
 - Able to access and use an effective communication network to reach stakeholders not attending the public meetings
 - Committed to completing all aspects of the charge of the NCCRSG
- **Checking back with constituencies.** NCCRSG members have been recruited based upon their ability to ably represent the views of one or more important constituencies. NCCRSG members commit to: making themselves available to communicate with interested stakeholder constituents, keeping their constituencies informed of the NCCRSG's efforts, and reporting relevant feedback to the NCCRSG. In reporting back, NCCRSG members will strive to integrate the views of their constituency rather than resorting to a "lowest common denominator" portrayal. In checking back with their constituencies, NCCRSG members will seek to avoid prejudging preliminary proposals still in development by the NCCRSG.
- **Seating of primary participants.** During NCCRSG meetings, the following participants will be seated at the main table: primary NCCRSG members, the BRTF liaison, NCC Science Sub-Team members in attendance, lead MLPA Initiative and DFG staff, and project facilitators. NCCRSG alternates, other staff, and members of the public will be seated nearby.

Participation and Collaboration

- **Primary and alternate NCCRSG members.**
 - Primary NCCRSG members will make every effort to attend all of the NCCRSG meetings. Alternate members are also strongly encouraged to attend all meetings.
 - Primary NCCRSG members will work with their alternates to ensure that they are informed regarding NCCRSG deliberations. This will enable alternates to step in effectively as needed and keep the project from “backsliding.” Primary and alternate members are encouraged to confer in advance of the meetings or during meeting breaks. They are also encouraged to confer with their broader constituencies at these times.
 - Discussion at NCCRSG meetings will principally involve primary NCCRSG members, members of the NCC Science Sub-Team, and MLPA Initiative and DFG staff. Primary members may call upon their alternates to address issues outside of their areas of expertise. At their discretion, meeting facilitators may call upon alternate members. Alternate members are encouraged to actively participate in breakout sessions.
- **Active, focused participation.** Every participant is responsible for communicating his/her perspectives and interests on the issues under consideration. Voicing these perspectives is essential to enable meaningful dialogue. Everyone will participate; no one will dominate. Only one person will speak at a time. Everyone will help keep the meetings on track.
- **Respectful interaction.** Participants will respect each other’s personal integrity, values and legitimacy of interests. Participants will avoid personal attacks and stereotyping.
- **Integration and creative thinking.** In developing, reviewing and revising work products, participants will strive to be open-minded and to integrate each other’s ideas, perspectives and interests. Disagreements will be regarded as problems to be solved rather than battles to be won. Participants will attempt to reframe contentious issues and offer creative solutions to enable constructive dialogue.
- **Mutual gains approach.** Participants will work to satisfy not only their own interests but also those of other NCCRSG members. Participants are encouraged to be clear about their own interests and to recognize the important distinction between underlying interests and fixed positions.
- **Commitment to ground rules.** As a set of mutual obligations, NCCRSG members will commit to adhere to these ground rules once they are ratified. NCCRSG members are encouraged to help uphold and enforce these ground rules. If an NCCRSG member consistently deviates from these ground rules, that member may be replaced by another person upon confirmation by the director of DFG and the chair of the BRTF.

Participation of Federal, State and Local Agencies

- Given the significant portion of the north central coast study region that is under the jurisdiction of federal, state, and local agencies, the active participation of these agencies is welcome and encouraged in the north central coast process.

Commitment to process

- Participants will make a good faith effort to achieving the goals of the project on the schedule proposed.
- Participants will review meeting materials in advance of the meetings and come prepared to address the meeting objectives.
- Meetings will start on time. Participants who know that they will be absent, late, or have to leave early will inform project staff in advance and coordinate with their alternates as needed.
- Cell phones, pagers and other electronic devices will be turned off or set to “silent” mode.

Identifying and Considering Alternative MPA Proposals

- The North Central Coast Project has been structured to allow time for developing and deliberating multiple alternative MPA proposals. This process will be an iterative one, with time allocated for SAT, BRTF and public review.
- NCCRSRG members will be open to proposals from other NCCRSRG members or from others outside the NCCRSRG.
- As part of their work, NCCRSRG members will strive to identify and consider alternative MPA proposals. NCCRSRG members will consider, using best readily available science and information, how each alternative proposal satisfies the goals and objectives established for the MLPA North Central Coast Study Region. The result of this deliberation is intended to allow the BRTF, DFG, and the California Fish and Game Commission to understand how the alternative proposals identified will satisfy the Marine Life Protection Act.
- The NCCRSRG facilitation team will seek to foster approaches to meeting management, and to the identification and consideration of alternative MPA proposals, which maximize joint gains and mutual benefit, and also optimize efficiency.

NCCRSRG Decision Rules

- NCCRSRG members recognize the need to make simple process agreements to move the effort forward. NCCRSRG facilitators may use “straw votes” to track progress and help the group arrive at short-term decisions to propel the process forward in an efficient fashion.
- NCCRSRG members will strive to achieve a high level of consensus (i.e., broad based agreement) in developing and advancing alternative proposals for MPAs. The intent here is to strive for MPA proposals that earn broad support across NCCRSRG members’

interests, not to accord NCCRSRG members a “de facto” veto on substantive issues. The objection of a few NCCRSRG members will not be grounds to impede movement.

Cooperation with North Central Coast Science Sub-Team (Science Sub-Team)

- NCCRSRG members will work cooperatively with the Science Sub-Team in developing options and work products. The Science Sub-Team will assist the NCCRSRG by reviewing draft documents, addressing scientific issues and information provided by the NCCSRG, and helping to frame and refer policy challenges to the BRTF. At their discretion, MLPA Initiative and DFG staff may plan for joint meetings or work sessions of the SAT or Science Sub-Team and the NCCRSRG.

Briefings to the BRTF

- NCCRSRG members will have an opportunity to present focused briefings on the progress of MPA proposal development to the BRTF. The BRTF is expected to provide feedback on draft MPA proposals for consideration by the NCCRSRG.

Multi-interest Work Teams

- DFG and MLPA Initiative staff expect that cross-interest group work teams will be an essential way to develop constructive, integrative work products during and between NCCRSRG meetings. The aim of such work teams is to encourage multi-interest options and work products rather than work products put forward by a single bloc or interest group. It is anticipated that work teams will meet primarily by teleconference, although in-person meetings are encouraged.
- Work teams will be composed to include appropriate expertise and balance of interests. To the extent possible, work teams will be composed of primary representatives. When a primary representative is unavailable or lacks suitable expertise, an alternate representative may be selected to serve.

Media Contact

- NCCRSRG meetings are public and will be simultaneously webcast. Audio and video archives of the meetings will be available on the MLPA website a few days after each meeting.
- Media contacts regarding the project from a “big picture” perspective will be handled by MLPA Initiative and DFG staff. First contacts should go to Steve Martarano, DFG information officer at (916) 654-5866, (916) 804-1714, cell; or Melissa Miller-Henson, MLPA Initiative operations and communications manager at (916) 654-2506, cell (530) 400-2545.
- On occasion, reporters may call individual NCCRSRG members for comment about a particular issue. Members who are contacted by the media will speak only on behalf of their group or constituency, or concerning the NCCRSRG’s progress in the MLPA process. After commenting, please contact an MLPA communications person listed above to give them a “heads up” that a media entity is working on a story.
- NCCRSRG members recognize the need to maintain a balance between providing timely information to constituents and making statements to the media that could undermine

the success of the MLPA process. NCCRSG members agree to avoid: a) making statements to the media that may prejudice the project's outcome, b) representing another group's point of view or characterizing their motives, or c) stating positions on preliminary proposals while they are still in development or refinement by work teams or by the NCCRSG.

- NCCRSG members will refer requests for additional contacts to MLPA and DFG staff listed above or the NCCRSG contact list. If needed, the NCCRSG may convene a multi-interest media subcommittee to work with MLPA Initiative and DFG staff to develop briefings for the media.
- In briefing constituents, NCCRSG members are encouraged to rely primarily on key outcomes memoranda to be produced for the meetings.

Public Comment

- Designated times at NCCRSG meetings will be agendized for public comment. Efforts will be made to hold public comment at consistent time slots and keyed to important NCCRSG work product discussions. At all other times of the meeting, comments and discussion will be only among NCCRSG members and alternates, Science Sub-Team members, and MLPA Initiative and DFG staff.
- To the extent possible, public comments will be directed toward the work effort, products, or process of the NCCRSG. Comments on subjects external to the MLPA should be directed to other forums.
- Members of the public are encouraged to convey their comments to relevant colleagues who serve as NCCRSG members or alternates. Members of the public are also encouraged to submit comments in writing (via email to MLPAComments@resources.ca.gov). Written comments will be distributed to NCCRSG members.
- Public comments may be limited to up to 3 minutes per individual speaker. The NCCRSG facilitation team will exercise flexibility in allocation of speaking time depending on the number of comments.
- The MLPA Initiative Team will respond as appropriate to questions and suggestions posed in public comment portions of NCCRSG meetings.

Information Sharing and Joint Fact Finding

- NCCRSG members recognize that the MLPA North Central Coast Project relies on using the best readily available information.
- MLPA Initiative and DFG staff intend to create multiple opportunities for data sharing and joint fact finding within the NCCRSG.
- NCCRSG members are encouraged to be as specific as possible in identifying types of information they believe will support the development of work products, including alternative proposals of marine protected areas. NCCRSG members commit to share, and not withhold, relevant information to inform the revision of the *Regional Profile of the*

North Central Coast Study Region (Alder Creek/Point Arena to Pigeon Point, California)
and the identification of candidate MPAs.

- NCCRS work teams may develop preliminary MPA proposals, which should be regarded as tentative and not subject to broad distribution until they have been presented to the NCCRS. Tentative information will be treated as such.
- In the event that two or more data sets or interpretations appear to conflict, participants will work collaboratively with members of the Science Sub-Team to narrow or clarify the basis of disagreement.

Email Communications and the Use of List Servers

- Email list servers have been created to help facilitate communication among NCCRS members about the MLPA process and, specifically, the NCCRS's task at hand (helping the State of California redesign the array of MPAs along the north central coast). The lists are intended primarily for asking or answering factual questions related to the MLPA Initiative, exchanging ideas about specific MPAs, requesting or providing specific studies to help inform decision-making, etc.
- NCCRS members agree that messages to these lists should remain on point to the core charge of the NCCRS.
- To that end, NCCRS members agree to keep messages relatively short (no more than a paragraph or two unless more is really necessary to answer a question), and include a statement of what you expect recipients to do with the information (i.e., what is your question, whose question are you answering, how could the information being provided be used in the decision-making process).
- NCCRS members agree that messages intended for only one person, or a handful of people, be directed to those individuals and not the entire list.
- MLPA Initiative staff does not intend to moderate the list servers. Staff also recognizes that information overload is a real concern to many of the stakeholders. Staff will periodically assess use of the list servers.
- NCCRS members agree to self-moderate use of the list servers and, when necessary, to gently remind one another of this ground rule.

Role of Facilitation Team

- The NCCRS facilitation team is non-partisan; they have no stake in any particular set of alternative MPA proposals. They will not act as an advocate for particular outcomes. The facilitators will strive to ensure that all NCCRS members clearly articulate their respective interests and to assist members to complete their work in a well-informed and efficient fashion.
- The facilitation team will use its discretion in guiding meetings and may propose agenda adjustments. The facilitation team may also use straw voting to track a range of preferences on emerging issues.

- The NCCRS facilitation team will prepare key outcomes memoranda to summarize the main results of the NCCRS meetings. These key outcomes memoranda will not strive to serve as a transcript of the meetings; rather, they will endeavor to summarize key decisions made, issues discussed, and the next steps identified for moving the project forward. The facilitators will prepare key outcomes memoranda within 7-10 days of the meetings.

**California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative
North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group
Proposed Meeting Agenda
(revised February 20, 2008)**

**Thursday, February 21, 2008
9:30 a.m.**

**Four Points by Sheraton *
1010 Northgate Drive
San Rafael, CA 94903**

Public participation: Members of the public are invited to attend the meeting in person or view and listen to the meeting via simultaneous webcasting on the Internet; an archived version will be available approximately two days after the meeting. Please visit the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) website at www.dfg.ca.gov/mlpa/meetings.asp for more information.

The public will be invited to offer comments on the work of the MLPA North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group at approximately 12:30 p.m. Speaker cards will be requested and may be found at the entrance to the room.

Briefing documents and meeting presentations/handouts: Please note that briefing documents are listed at the bottom of the agenda as either attachments (received in advance of the meeting) or handouts (received on the day of the meeting).

Meeting Objectives

- *Receive and discuss MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT) evaluations, California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) feasibility analysis, staff evaluations, and MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF) guidance regarding draft marine protected area proposals*
- *Receive presentation from special closures work group on disturbance issues; discuss options and guidance for incorporation*
- *Receive presentation regarding key themes and ideas from public workshops*
- *Outline the process for developing the final round of marine protected area (MPA) proposals*
- *Plan next steps to revise draft MPA proposals at March 4, 2008 North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (NCCRSG) work session and March 18-19, 2008 NCCRSG meeting*

Meeting Agenda (see next page)

Note: the stakeholder group will break for lunch at approximately 12:00 noon and public comment will be taken immediately following at approximately 12:45 p.m.

** This facility is accessible to persons with disabilities. To request reasonable accommodations for a disability, please contact California Relay Service (at least two days prior to the meeting) at 800.735.2929 (TT) or 800.735.2922 (voice) and ask them to contact the California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative at 916.653.5656.*

Meeting Agenda

Note: the stakeholder group will break for lunch at approximately 11:45 a.m. and public comment will be taken immediately following at approximately 12:30 p.m.

9:00 a.m.		<i>Arrivals, refreshments, and greetings</i>
9:30 a.m.	1.	Welcome, introductions, and review of meeting objectives
9:45 a.m.	2.	Provide status reports from recent SAT and BRTF meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SAT update (Attachments 10, 11, 19; Handouts A, B) BRTF update – guidance to the NCCRSG and other actions (Handouts C, D) Update on DFG guidance (Attachments 20, 22; Handout E)
10:15 a.m.	3.	Present summary of water quality issues (Attachments 24, 25)
10:30 a.m.		<i>Break</i>
10:45 a.m.	4.	Present findings of SAT, MLPA staff, and DFG evaluations of draft proposals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff overview and evaluations (Attachments 1-6, 18; Handouts F, G) SAT evaluations (Attachments 12-15; Handout H) Recreational and commercial fishing analyses (Attachment 16; Handout I) Evaluation of potential recreational abalone fishery and management impacts (Attachment 17; Handout J) DFG feasibility evaluation (Attachment 21; Handout K)
2:30 p.m.	5.	Receive other informational presentations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcomes of special closures work group (Handouts L, M) Summary of Public Workshops – key themes that emerged (Handout N)
3:00 p.m.		<i>Break</i>
3:15 p.m.	6.	Outline next steps in the marine protected area proposal development process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Similarities and differences among draft MPA proposals (Attachments 7-9) Outline process to develop final round of MPA proposals Identify platforms for building round 3 proposals
5:00 p.m.	7.	Recap and plan next steps to prepare for March 4, 2008 work session and March 18-19, 2008 meeting of the NCCRSG
5:30 p.m.		<i>Adjourn</i>

Attachments

1. MPA Proposal 0 (existing MPAs): Staff summary of proposal areas, habitats and MPAs, habitat calculations, and proposal description generated by staff
2. Draft MPA Proposal 1 (EC): Staff summary of draft proposal areas, habitats and MPAs, habitat calculations, and proposal description generated by NCCRSG work groups
3. Draft MPA Proposal 2 (JD): Staff summary of draft proposal areas, habitats and MPAs, habitat calculations, and proposal description generated by NCCRSG work groups

4. Draft MPA Proposal 3 (TC): Staff summary of a draft proposal areas, habitats and MPAs, habitat calculations, and proposal description generated by NCCRSR work groups
5. Draft MPA Proposal 4 (JC): Staff summary of draft proposal areas, habitats and MPAs, habitat calculations, and proposal description generated by NCCRSR work groups
6. Draft External MPA Proposal A (XA): Staff summary of a draft proposal areas, habitats and MPAs, habitat calculations, and proposal description generated by proponent
7. Area charts showing percentage of study region by proposed designation and SAT-assigned levels of protection for Proposal 0 (existing MPAs), draft proposals 1-4, and Draft External MPA Proposal A
8. Map showing areas of overlap among draft MPA proposals 1-4 and Draft External MPA Proposal A
9. Side-by-side comparison of geographies and proposed regulations for Proposal 0 (existing MPAs), draft MPA proposals 1-4, and Draft External MPA Proposal A.
 - Subregion 1: Alder Creek to Horseshoe Point
 - Subregion 2: Horseshoe Point to Bodega Head
 - Subregion 3: Bodega Head to Double Point
 - Subregion 4: Double Point to Point San Pedro
 - Subregion 5: Point San Pedro to Pigeon Point
 - Subregion 6: Farallon Islands
10. Complete responses to science questions from the November 28, 2007, and December 11-12, 2007 MLPA North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group meetings
11. *Methods Used to Evaluate Draft MPA Proposals in the North Central Coast Study Region* (February 1, 2008 revised draft)
12. MLPA goals 1 & 4 analysis: *Draft MPA Proposal Evaluations North Central Coast Study Region* (January 23, 2008)
13. MLPA goals 2 & 6 analysis: *North Central Coast Size and Spacing Evaluations* (revised January 25, 2007)
14. *Draft Evaluation of Potential Benefits to Seabirds from Proposed Marine Protected Areas in the MLPA North Central Coast Study Region* (Gerard J. McChesney, MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team, January 2008)
15. *Draft Evaluation of Potential Benefits to Marine Mammals from Proposed Marine Protected Areas in the MLPA North Central Coast Study Region* (Sarah Allen, MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team, January 2008)
16. *Summary of potential impacts of the December 2007 MPA proposals on commercial and recreational fisheries in the North Central Coast Study Region* (Ecotrust, January 22, 2008)
17. *Evaluation of the Potential Impacts Draft Marine Protected Area Proposals May Pose for Abalone Management and Abalone Recreational Fishery, MLPA North Central Coast Study Region* (Revised February 15, 2008)
18. MLPA Initiative Staff evaluation of MLPA Goal 3
19. *Spatially Explicit Models to Support Evaluation and Revision of Draft Marine Protected Area Proposals* (Digestible Modeling Work Group, MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team, February 13, 2008)
20. California Department of Fish and Game memo regarding an update of the feasibility criteria for use in analyzing siting alternatives
21. *North Central Coast Study Region Feasibility Evaluation of Draft MPA Proposals* (California Department of Fish and Game, February 11, 2008)
22. California Department of Fish and Game memo regarding private land ownership and marine protected areas

- 23. *California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative North Central Coast Regional Planning Timeline* (revised February 6, 2008)
- 24. PowerPoint presentation: *Water Quality Along the North Central Coast* (Dominic Gregorio, California State Water Resources Control Board, December 2007)
- 25. *Areas of Special Biological Significance (ASBSs) within the Marine Life Protection Act North Central Coast Study Region, reasons for designation and unique features* (State Water Resources Control Board, January 28, 2008)

Handouts

- A. PowerPoint presentation: *Master Plan Science Advisory Team Update* (Jason Vasques, California Department of Fish and Game)
- B. Memo and responses to science questions from the August 22-23, 2007, and October 16-17, 2007 meetings of the MLPA North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group
- C. *California MLPA North Central Coast Project, North Central Coast Regional Goals and Objectives* (as adopted by the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force on February 14, 2008)
- D. *Summary of MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force Guidance to the North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group, February 14, 2008 BRTF meeting* (prepared February 20, 2008)
- E. PowerPoint presentation: *Update on Department of Fish and Game Guidance for MPA Proposals* (Susan Ashcraft, California Department of Fish and Game)
- F. PowerPoint presentation: *Overview of Draft Marine Protected Area Proposals* (Evan Fox, MLPA Initiative)
- G. PowerPoint presentation: *Staff Evaluation of Draft Marine Protected Area Proposals* (Evan Fox, MLPA Initiative)
- H. PowerPoint presentation: *SAT Evaluations of Draft MPA Proposals North Central Coast Study Region* (Dr. Mark Carr, MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team)
- I. PowerPoint presentation: *Summary of Potential Impacts of December 2007 MPA Proposals on Commercial and Recreational Fisheries* (Dr. Sarah Kruse, Ecotrust)
- J. PowerPoint presentation: *Evaluation of the Potential Impact of Draft MPA Proposals on Abalone Recreational Fishery and Abalone Management in the North Central Coast Study Region* (Susan Ashcraft, California Department of Fish and Game)
- K. PowerPoint presentation: *Department of Fish and Game Feasibility Analysis of Draft MPA Proposals* (Susan Ashcraft, California Department of Fish and Game)
- L. PowerPoint presentation: *Consideration of Special Closures for Seabird and Marine Mammal Disturbance* (Susan Ashcraft, California Department of Fish and Game and Allison Arnold, MLPA Initiative)
- M. Memo regarding status report of the NCCRSG Special Closures Work Group, with draft options and maps
- N. Summary of key themes from February 4, 5 and 6 public workshops (includes table of public comments received at the workshops regarding draft MPA proposals for the MLPA North Central Coast Study Region)

Key Outcomes Memorandum

Date: March 3, 2008

To: Members, MLPA North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (NCCRSR)

From: Scott McCreary and Eric Poncelet, CONCUR, Inc.

Re: Key Outcomes Memorandum – February 21, 2008 NCCRSR Meeting

cc: MLPA Initiative Staff and California Department of Fish and Game MLPA Staff

Executive Summary – Key Outcomes

On February 21, 2008, the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) Initiative North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (NCCRSR) participated in its seventh meeting, in San Rafael, CA. **Key outcomes** from the meeting are as follows:

- NCCRSR members received and briefly discussed the results of several evaluations of the “draft marine protected area (MPA) proposals”. They included MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT) evaluations on habitat representation, size/spacing, habitat replication, and bird and mammal protection; staff’s MLPA Goal 3 evaluation; Ecotrust’s evaluations of potential recreational and commercial socioeconomic impacts; the California Department of Fish and Game’s (DFG) feasibility analysis and evaluation of potential recreational abalone impacts; and two supplementary evaluations using models developed by a work group of the SAT.
- NCCRSR members also received a summary of key guidance from the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF).
- I-Team staff clarified past guidance and summarized new guidance for developing MPA proposals.
- NCCRSR members received an informational briefing on water quality issues in the MLPA North Central Coast Study Region.
- I-Team staff presented an overview of initial options for special closures identified by the NCCRSR Special Closures Work Group
- I-Team staff presented an overview of the comments submitted to the NCCRSR at the February 4-6, 2008 public workshops and requested that NCCRSR members take account of these comments in their ongoing MPA planning efforts.
- NCCRSR members participated in a “straw ballot” exercise to inform the selection of “platforms” (i.e., starting places) for building the next iteration of MPA proposals. As not all of the NCCRSR “seats” (pair of primary and alternate) were present at the meeting, the timing for transmitting straw ballots was extended. I-Team staff scheduled a follow-up NCCRSR conference call for February 26 to review the results of the straw voting and continue discussions to identify platforms. No results were discussed at the February 21, 2008 meeting.

Key next steps include:

- NCCRSR members to prepare for the March 4, 2008 work session by reviewing the evaluations of the draft MPA proposals and by considering possible ways to revise the proposals. NCCRSR members to also consider ways by which the draft MPA proposals may be reduced to no more than three platforms to inform development of the next iteration of MPA proposals.

I. Meeting Participants and Materials

Fifteen NCCRS primary members and fourteen alternate members participated in the February 21, 2007 meeting.

MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT) members participating in the meeting included Mark Carr, Steven Morgan, Gerry McChesney, and Dominic Gregorio.

MLPA Initiative and California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) staff—collectively known as the “I-Team”—staffed the meeting.

An extended list of meeting materials was used to support the meeting. These materials, including copies of the PowerPoint presentations, may be found on the MLPA website at:
http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mlpa/meeting_022108.asp

II. Key Outcomes

A. NCCRS members received and discussed SAT, DFG, and staff evaluations of the “draft MPA proposals”

1. **SAT members, DFG representatives, and I-Team staff presented the results of various evaluations of the draft MPA proposals.** These evaluations, along with the PowerPoint presentations, were distributed as part of the meeting materials. I-Team staff strongly encouraged NCCRS members to review these documents. Key evaluations included the following:

- SAT evaluation (habitat representation, size/spacing, habitat replication, and bird and mammal protection)
- Potential recreational and commercial socioeconomic analyses
- Evaluation of potential recreational abalone impacts
- DFG feasibility evaluation
- Staff’s MLPA Goal 3 evaluation
- Two supplementary evaluations using models developed by a work group of the SAT

2. **DFG staff clarified and updated guidance for developing MPAs**

DFG staff offered the following additional guidance for designing MPAs and completing the MPA proposal template forms in the next iteration:

- When an MPA is intended in an estuary where waterfowl hunting occurs, it should be designated as a state marine recreational management area (SMRMA).
- When an MPA is intended in an area where there is an existing mariculture lease, it should be designated as a state marine conservation area (SMCA) allowing mariculture until the lease expires. If waterfowl hunting also occurs in the estuary, the MPA should be designated as an SMRMA.
- Latitude and longitude coordinates should be captured for each boundary of an MPA.
- Shoreward boundaries should be designated as “mean high tide.”
- Allowed/disallowed uses should take the form: “All take is prohibited, except....”

- Regulations should specify whether they apply to commercial and/or recreational activities in all MPAs.
- Regulations should specify species/gear types consistent with the NCCRSG's intent. If these are not specified, the broadest interpretation will be assumed (e.g. "All take is prohibited, except for recreational and commercial take of crab" would be interpreted to apply to all types of crab, not just Dungeness crab).
- If used, floating corners should be placed, in descending level of desirability, on whole minutes, 1/2 minutes, or 1/10 minutes of latitude and longitude.
- If used, diagonal lines should follow the angle of the coastline and be anchored at whole minutes of latitude and longitude.
- Distance offshore can be used to delineate boundaries in the Farallon Islands if extending from the shore to the state waters line.
- Stakeholders should consider simplifying/changing existing MPA regulations and boundaries that don't meet DFG feasibility criteria.

3. Participants offered key clarifying comments on the evaluations

Key comments included:

- Mark Carr (SAT) clarified that the models that have been developed by a work group of the SAT (EDOM and UC Davis) are being used as a supplement to the existing evaluation methods.
- Several NCCRSG members pointed out that the SAT work group's models, like all models, are limited by both the data used and the underlying assumptions. Stakeholders need to be aware of these assumptions and any data limitations.
- Several NCCRSG members suggested that the SAT be careful in the nomenclature used to describe the modeling results, particularly with regard to the phrasing of "win-win" scenarios. These stakeholders noted that "heavy overfishing" is against the law and should not be associated with a "win".
- Dr. Sarah Kruse (Ecotrust) emphasized that potential socioeconomic impacts need to be understood in terms of both percentage changes to revenue and changes in revenue dollars. Stakeholders also noted that it might also be helpful to have the percentage impact expressed in absolute terms (e.g., in terms of the number of fish caught).
- NCCRSG members emphasized the importance of using appropriate, up-to-date information as the baseline for SAT and staff evaluations. In particular, NCCRSG members questioned the use of 2005 abalone catch data as a baseline, given that these data included elevated catch due to the opening of abalone fishing at Stornetta Ranch.

B. NCCRSG members received summary of key guidance from BRTF

I-Team staff presented a summary of the BRTF's guidance that emerged from its February 14, 2008 meeting. I-Team staff reiterated the importance of this guidance and encouraged all NCCRSG members to review the summary document that was distributed with the meeting materials.

C. NCCRSG members received an informational briefing on water quality in the MLPA North Central Coast Study Region

SAT member Dominic Gregorio presented an overview of a longer PowerPoint presentation on water quality that was distributed as part of the meeting materials. In his presentation, Dominic reviewed water quality laws, policies, and plans as they related to the MLPA. He also identified the

state's water quality protection areas (a type of marine managed area) and their locations within the North Central Coast Study Region. Finally, he described some of the region's impaired water bodies and the associated contaminants.

D. NCCRSG received a presentation on the status of the Special Closures Work Group

SAT member Gerry McChesney presented an overview of seabird and marine mammal hotspots and disturbance issues in the North Central Coast Study Region. I-Team staff summarized the efforts of a Special Closures Work Group composed of NCCRSG members and select additional participants from peer agencies and ecotourism interests that met twice in January to discuss the special closures issue. This work group identified 13 potentially important "hot spot" locations and a menu of possible options for using special closures at these locations. Staff emphasized that the work group had produced options for consideration by the broader NCCRSG but had not been striving to produce consensus recommendations.

I-Team staff reiterated the BRTF's guidance on the topic, including:

- The NCCRSG may elect to include recommendations for special closures in the MPA proposals so long as this does not detract from the NCCRSG's primary task of developing alternative MPA proposals.
- Special closures should be used sparingly and selectively.
- Refinement of special closures options may require an additional meeting of the NCCRSG Special Closures Work Group.

E. NCCRSG received a compilation of public comments submitted during February 4-6, 2008 public workshops

I-Team staff provided an overview of the comments received from members of the public during the February 4-6 public workshops in Petaluma, Gualala, and Pacifica. Staff requested that NCCRSG members review the comments and incorporate them into the next iteration of MPA proposals.

F. Public comment

The February 21 meeting included a designated public comment period. Over 15 members of the public provided comments. Key comments included:

- Citizens from the Point Arena area submitted a proposal for improving MPA siting and designation in the Point Arena area. These recommendations have been adopted in a resolution by the Point Arena City Council.
- The SAT may not be using the best available science to develop the levels of protection for aquaculture (and shellfish cultures in particular) may be inaccurate. These speakers committed to send supporting materials to the SAT.
- Multiple views on the future planning for Drakes Estero were expressed. Some members of the public noted that the Oyster Company has a lease with DFG that runs through 2029. Don Neubacher (NCCRSG member representing the National Park Service) clarified that the state ceded jurisdiction of the seafloor bottom of Drakes Bay to the National Park Service and, as such, the current lease with the National Park Service will take precedence over the DFG lease.
- SAT models on fishery and conservation impacts need to be credible and based on real world conditions.

- NCCRSG members need to take into account the limited access to abalone diving in the Salt Point area.
- The amount of area for non-consumptive diving that would be protected in state marine reserves needs to be increased.
- Enforcement issue: Boats and divers may have difficulties adhering to MPA boundaries because they do not have GPS systems or because MPA boundaries are difficult to see from offshore.
- Fishermen from the Bolinas area described how they are already constrained by unpredictable salmon runs and other federal restrictions (e.g., Rockfish Conservation Area, VMS requirements). MPAs may have a negative impact on one of their remaining consistent fisheries, halibut.
- Grey whales, harbor porpoises, and humpback whales should be evaluated by the SAT as part of the list of species likely to benefit from MPAs.
- Certain areas (e.g., the pier at Lindamar Beach) should be kept open to shore fishing for cultural and historic reasons.
- Staff should organize evening meetings to accommodate interested citizens who must work during the day.

G. NCCRSG members participated in a “straw balloting” exercise to help identify three “platforms” for building the next iteration of MPA proposals

In response to the BRTF’s guidance that the NCCRSG forward no more than three MPA proposals, I-Team staff composed a “straw balloting” process. The purpose of the straw balloting process was to help inform the selection of three “platforms” (defined as “starting places”) for building the next iteration of MPA proposals. Each NCCRSG “seat” (pair of primary and alternate members) was invited to participate in the straw balloting process. In all, 19 NCCRSG “seats” cast votes for their top three platform choices.

Noting that four of the NCCRSG’s 24 total “seats” were not present for the straw vote, I-Team staff recommended that the straw voting period be extended until votes could be received from the remaining “seats”. The results of the straw voting would be kept confidential until that time.

I-Team staff scheduled a follow-up NCCRSG conference call for February 26, 2008 to review the results of the straw voting and continue discussions to identify platforms for developing the next iteration of MPA proposals. No results were discussed at the February 21, 2008 meeting.

H. Next NCCRSG meeting

The next NCCRSG meeting is scheduled for March 18-19, 2007. The I-Team has also scheduled an NCCRSG work session on March 4, 2008. Both the meeting and work session will take place in San Rafael. *Objectives* for the March 4 work session are as follows:

- Provide work groups with opportunity to discuss possible revisions to the draft MPA proposals and options for arriving at three platforms for the next iteration of MPA proposals (including possible integration of proposals)
- Invite informal caucusing among NCCRSG members
- Create an opportunity for NCCRSG to identify platforms for the next iteration of MPA proposals and work teams
- Initiate work team development of the next iteration of MPA proposals

- Plan next steps for March 18-19, 2008 NCCRSG meeting

III. Recap of Next Steps

A. Key next steps for NCCRSG members

1. Prepare for March 4, 2008 work session.
 - Review the evaluations of the draft MPA proposals and begin thinking about possible ways to revise/converge the proposals
 - Consider ways by which the draft MPA proposals may be reduced to no more than three platforms to inform development of the next iteration of MPA proposals

B. Key next steps for I-Team staff

1. Prepare agenda and materials for March 4, 2008 work session.

C. Other upcoming meeting dates

March 4, 2008:	NCCRSG work session to begin developing next iteration of MPA proposals
March 18-19, 2008	NCCRSG meeting to complete development of next iteration of MPA proposals
April 3, 2008:	SAT meeting to evaluate next iteration of MPA proposals
April 22-23, 2008:	BRTF meeting to evaluate next iteration of MPA proposals and prepare a recommended alternative

**California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative
North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group
Work Session Draft Agenda
(revised March 3, 2008)**

***Tuesday, March 4, 2008
8:30 a.m. – 5:30 p.m.***

**Four Points by Sheraton *
1010 Northgate Drive
San Rafael, CA 94903**

Work Session Objectives

- *Provide work groups an opportunity to discuss possible revisions to draft marine protected area (MPA) proposals and options for arriving at three platforms for next iteration of MPA proposals (including possible integration of proposals)*
- *Invite informal caucusing among MLPA North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (NCCRSG) members*
- *Create an opportunity for the NCCRSG to identify platforms and work teams for the next iteration of MPA proposals*
- *Initiate work team development of MPA proposals*
- *Plan next steps for the March 18-19, 2008 NCCRSG meeting*

Work Session Agenda

8:00 AM	<i>NCCRSG members gather; breakfast is available</i>
8:30 AM	[Plenary] Welcome and agenda review
8:40 AM	[Plenary] Updates <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Overview of supporting guidance documents (Attachments 1-4)• Special closures update• Abalone evaluation (Handout B)
8:50 AM	[Breakout] Proposal work groups meet
9:50 AM	[Breakout] Informal caucusing among NCCRSG members to discuss possible proposal revisions
10:50 AM	<i>Break</i>
11:05 AM	[Plenary] Proposal representatives (draft proposals 1, 2, 3 and 4) outline initial ideas for revising draft MPA proposals and other new ideas for identifying platforms for next iteration of MPA proposals (10 minutes each)
11:50 AM	[Plenary] NCCRSG members discuss and identify platforms and work teams for next iteration of MPA proposals
12:30 PM	<i>Working lunch (provided onsite for NCCRSG members)</i>

** This facility is accessible to persons with disabilities. To request reasonable accommodations for a disability, please contact California Relay Service (at least two days prior to the meeting) at 800.735.2929 (TT) or 800.735.2922 (voice) and ask them to contact the California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative at 916.654.1885.*

1:00 PM	[Plenary] Continue NCCRSG discussion and identification of platforms and work teams for next iteration of MPA proposals
1:45 PM	[Work teams] Begin to develop MPA proposals for next iteration
4:45 PM	[Work teams] Plan next steps to continue developing MPA proposals in advance of the March 18-19, 2008 NCCRSG meeting
5:00 PM	[Plenary] Work teams report back to full plenary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recap key revisions discussed • Recap work team preparations for March 18-19, 2008 meeting
5:30 PM	Adjourn

Attachments

1. *Summary of Guidelines for Creating Marine Protected Areas* (February 1, 2008)
2. *Guidance for Completing the Marine Protected Area Proposal Templates* (revised February 28, 2008)
3. *Examples of marine protected area regulations, boundary descriptions and specific objectives from the MLPA central coast process* (February 15, 2008)
4. Size and level of protection statistics for MPA clusters in draft proposals for the north central coast
5. Spacing between marine protected area clusters in draft proposals for the north central coast

Handouts

- A. March 3, 2008 memo regarding the application of science size guidelines
- B. *Supplement to Evaluation of the Potential Impacts Draft Marine Protected Area Proposals May Pose for Abalone Management and Abalone Recreational Fishery, MLPA North Central Coast Study Region* (March 3, 2008)

**California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative
North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group
Proposed Draft Meeting Agenda
(revised March 17, 2008)**

March 18, 2008 (9:00 a.m. – 5:45 p.m.)

March 19, 2008 (8:00 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.)

**Four Points by Sheraton *
1010 Northgate Drive
San Rafael, CA 94903**

Public participation: Members of the public are invited to attend the meeting in person or view and listen to the meeting via simultaneous webcasting on the Internet; an archived version will be available approximately two days after the meeting. Please visit the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) website at www.dfg.ca.gov/mlpa/meetings.asp for more information.

The public will be invited to offer comments on the work of the MLPA North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (NCCRSG) at approximately **1:15 p.m. on March 18 and 8:00 a.m. on March 19.**

Briefing documents and meeting presentations/handouts: Please note that briefing documents are listed at the bottom of the agenda as either attachments (received in advance of the meeting) or handouts (received on the day of the meeting).

Meeting Objectives

- *Develop final round of marine protected area (MPA) proposals to be forwarded to the MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT) and MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF)*
- *Provide opportunities for:*
 - *Proposal work teams to develop draft final MPA proposals*
 - *Full NCCRSG to comment on all three draft final MPA proposals*
 - *Proposal work teams to revise and finalize MPA proposals*
- *Determine how the NCCRSG will express support and preference for the final MPA proposals*
- *Plan next steps to present final MPA proposals to the BRTF*

Meeting Agenda – Tuesday, March 18, 2008

Note: the NCCRSG will break for lunch at approximately 12:30 p.m.

8:30 a.m.		Arrivals, refreshments, and greetings
9:00 a.m.	1.	[Plenary] Welcome, introductions, and review of meeting objectives
9:20 a.m.	2.	[Plenary] Updates <ul style="list-style-type: none">• California Department of Fish and Game guidance (Handout A; Attachment 2)• Input from marine bird and mammals disturbance work group (Attachment 1; Handout B)• Application of “levels of protection” (Handout C)
9:40 a.m.	3.	[Work teams] Proposal work teams develop draft final MPA proposals

** This facility is accessible to persons with disabilities. To request reasonable accommodations for a disability, please contact California Relay Service (at least two days prior to the meeting) at 800.735.2929 (TT) or 800.735.2922 (voice) and ask them to contact the California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative at 916.654.1885.*

12:30 p.m.		<i>Lunch (provided for NCCRSG members)</i>
1:15 p.m.	4.	Public comment
2:15 p.m.	5.	[Plenary] Proposal work teams present draft final proposals; NCCRSG members discuss and suggest revisions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal 1-3 • Proposal 4 • Proposal 2-XA
3:15 p.m.		<i>Break</i>
3:30 p.m.	5.	[Plenary] Continue discussion and comments on draft final proposals
5:30 p.m.	6.	[Plenary] Recap and review next steps
5:45 p.m.		<i>Recess</i>
6:45 p.m.		<i>Dinner (provided for NCCRSG members)</i>
Evening		Optional work session

Meeting Agenda – Wednesday, March 19, 2008

Note: the NCCRSG will break for lunch at approximately 12:15 p.m.

8:00 a.m.	7.	Public comment
8:30 a.m.	8.	[Work teams] Proposal work teams revise draft final proposals
12:15 p.m.		<i>Lunch (provided for NCCRSG members)</i>
1:00 p.m.	9.	[Plenary] Proposal work teams present final proposal revisions to NCCRSG <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal 4 • Proposal 2-XA • Proposal 1-3
2:15 p.m.		<i>Break</i>
2:30 p.m.	10.	[Plenary] Determine how to express support and preference for final proposals to be submitted to the BRTF
4:15 p.m.	11.	[Plenary] Recap and review next steps
4:30 p.m.		<i>Adjourn</i>

Attachments

1. March 13, 2008 memo regarding the characterization of potential special closures options by marine bird and mammal disturbance work group members (includes attachment with characterization of options for marine bird and mammal protection areas/special closures)
2. California Department of Fish and Game memo regarding an update to the *Supplement to Evaluation of the Potential Impacts Draft Marine Protected Area Proposals May Pose for Abalone Management and Abalone Recreational Fishery* (dated March 3, 2008)

Handouts

- A. California Department of Fish and Game memo regarding guidance for final MPA proposals development (March 13, 2008)
- B. Update to potential special closures options menu memorandum to reflect California Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidance (March 17, 2008), including updated characterization of options table
- C. PowerPoint presentation: *Update on Salmon Trolling Level of Protection Assigned by the SAT* (Dr. Mary Gleason, MLPA Initiative)
- D. Staff response to question #3 of the October 16-17, 2007 science questions and draft SAT response to the February 21, 2008 science question

Key Outcomes Memorandum

Date: April 4, 2008

To: Members, MLPA North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (NCCRSB)

From: Scott McCreary and Eric Poncelet, CONCUR, Inc.

Re: Key Outcomes Memorandum – March 18-19, 2008 NCCRSB Meeting

cc: MLPA Initiative Staff and California Department of Fish and Game MLPA Staff

Executive Summary – Key Outcomes

On March 18-19, 2008, the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) Initiative North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (NCCRSB) participated in its eighth meeting, in San Rafael, CA. **Key outcomes** from the meeting are as follows:

- NCCRSB members worked in a mix of breakout sessions and plenary discussions to successfully develop three NCCRSB MPA proposals to forward to the MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT) and the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF), thus fulfilling their major charge:
 - Proposal 1-3: This proposal evolved as a combination of draft proposal 1 (Emerald C) and draft proposal 3 (Turquoise C). This proposal sets aside approximately 21.6% of the study area in MPAs, 11.4% of which is in no-take reserves.
 - Proposal 2-XA: This proposal evolved as a combination of draft proposal 2 (Jade D) and Draft external proposal A from the Bodega Bay Fisherman's Marketing Association. This proposal sets aside approximately 18.0% of the study area in MPAs, 8.9% of which is in no-take reserves.
 - Proposal 4: This proposal evolved from draft proposal 4 (Jade C). This proposal sets aside approximately 26.9% of the study area in MPAs, 13.8% of which is in no-take reserves.
- The I-Team and BRTF Chair Susan Golding invited NCCRSB members to participate in Day 1 of the BRTF's next meeting, scheduled for April 22-23, 2008. All NCCRSB members will have an opportunity to assist proposal work team leads in presenting their MPA proposals to the BRTF and addressing BRTF questions. The meeting will also include specific recognition of NCCRSB members for their efforts in the north central coast process.
- NCCRSB members identified work team leads to take the lead in reviewing the proposal template forms and presenting the NCCRSB MPA proposals to the BRTF. Work team leads include: NCCRSB proposal 1-3 (Tom Baty, Rick Johnson, Samantha Murray), NCCRSB proposal 2-XA (Ben Sleeter, Ed Tavasieff), NCCRSB proposal 4 (Karen Garrison, Fred Smith).

Key **next steps** include the following:

- NCCRSB members to work with staff to QA/QC the proposal templates.
- Work team leads to plan presentations to the BRTF.
- Participate in Day 1 of the BRTF's April 22-23, 2008 meeting.

I. Meeting Participants and Materials

Twenty-one NCCRS primary members and seventeen alternate members participated in the March 18-19, 2007 meeting.

MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT) members participating in the meeting included Steven Morgan, Astrid Scholz, and Karina Nielsen. Chair Susan Golding participated on behalf of the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF).

MLPA Initiative and California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) staff—collectively known as the “I-Team”—staffed the meeting.

An extended list of meeting materials was used to support the meeting. These materials, including copies of the PowerPoint presentations, may be found on the MLPA website at:
http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mlpa/meeting_031808.asp

II. Key Outcomes

A. NCCRS members completed three NCCRS MPA proposals to forward to the SAT and BRTF for evaluation and consideration.

1. NCCRS members worked in an iterative mix of breakout sessions and plenary discussions to develop three MPA proposals to forward to the SAT and BRTF.

Three proposal work teams (1-3, 2-XA, and 4) worked in advance to prepare for the NCCRS meeting and then met on the morning of Day 1 to continue development of their MPA proposals. On the afternoon of Day 1, the work teams presented the current versions of their MPA proposals to the full NCCRS in a side-by-side format. NCCRS members asked clarifying questions and offered comments on all of the proposals. As part of this discussion, NCCRS members were provided with forms to write their comments or suggestions for improving each of the proposals. These were photocopied and distributed to each NCCRS member for use on Day 2.

On the morning of Day 2, the work teams revised their proposals, taking into account feedback from the full NCCRS as well as public comments from two public comment periods. The work teams presented the results of their efforts to the full NCCRS on the afternoon of Day 2.

The three NCCRS proposals showed strong similarities in terms of boundaries and regulations in certain parts of the study region (e.g., Point Reyes area, Farallon Islands). In other parts of the study region, the proposals showed distinct differences (e.g., Duxbury Reef, Black Point, Saunders Reef).

All three proposals included “special closures”, although the proposals differed in the number and size of special closures proposed. Special closures are a marine designation that is not an MPA, intended in this process to address seabird and/or marine mammal disturbance.

The NCCRS MPA proposals included the following:

- Proposal 1-3: This proposal evolved as a combination of draft proposal 1 (Emerald C) and draft proposal 3 (Turquoise C).
- Proposal 2-XA: This evolved as a combination of draft proposal 2 (Jade D) and external proposal A from the Bodega Bay Fisherman's Marketing Association.
- Proposal 4: This proposal evolved from draft proposal 4 (Jade C).

All three proposals considered and drew on ideas and interests from the other proposal work teams.

2. Proposal development focused on work teams.

Prior to the March 18-19, 2008 meeting, each NCCRSR member (both primaries and alternates) was asked to affiliate with one proposal work team for the final round of MPA proposal development. At the March 18-19, 2008 meeting, NCCRSR members focused their efforts on developing their own work team proposals.

An NCCRSR member's affiliation with a proposal work team did and does NOT necessarily indicate support for that work team's proposals.

Proposal work team affiliation was as follows*:

Work Team 1-3		Work Team 2-XA	Work Team 4
Tom Baty	Patty King	Dirk Ammerman	Christopher Chin
Ben Becker	Francesca Koe	Tom Estes	Karen Garrison
Bill Bernard	Irina Kogan	Aaron Golbus	Lance Morgan
Bob Breen	Samantha Murray	Tom Mattusch	Don Neubacher
Richard Charter	Kellyx Nelson	Mike McHenry	Fred Smith
Josh Churchman	Karen Reyna	John Mellor	Cassidy Teufel
Neal Desai	Santi Roberts	Craig Merrilees	Nick Tipon
Henry Fastenau	Phil Sanders	Paul Pierce	
Ellen Faurot-Dainels	Dave Schaub	Ben Sleeter	
Russ Herring	Craig Swolgaard	Ed Tavasieff	
Jim Hobbs	Sean White	Dave Yarger	
Rick Johnson	Bob Wilson		
Ken Jones	Jay Yokomizo		

*One NCCRSR member (Nelson Pinola) did not indicate affiliation with a work team.

3. Interim summary of proposals, reported by percentage of the study area in each classification.

The I-Team calculated for each proposal the percentage of the study area captured within each of the MPA classifications—e.g., State Marine Reserves (SMR), State Marine Conservation Areas (SMCA), State Marine Parks (SMP), and State Marine Recreational Management Area (SMRMA). The preliminary calculations reflected the status of the proposals as presented on the afternoon of Day 2. The calculations below also reflect quality control checks by the work teams of their proposals.

Proposal	SMR (%)	SMCA (%)	SMP (%)	SMRMA (%)	Total (%)
1-3	11.4	10.1	<0.1	0	21.6
2-XA	8.9	9.0	<0.1	<0.1	18.0
4	13.8	12.7	0.4	0	26.9

B. NCCRSg members discussed and outlined a general gameplan for briefing the BRTF on the results of the March 18-19, 2008 NCCRSg meeting.

1. NCCRSg members broadly supported indicating the general level of support for the three NCCRSg MPA proposals

NCCRSg members discussed alternative approaches for expressing support and preference for the three NCCRSg MPA proposals. NCCRSg members expressed broad support for indicating whether they could each “live with” (or not) the individual proposals as presented on Day 2 of the meeting.

2. NCCRSg members participated in a survey to express general levels of support for the MPA proposals as presented on Day 2 of the meeting.

I-Team staff prepared a survey form inviting each “seat” (i.e., primary/alternate pair) on the NCCRSg to indicate whether they “could live with” (or not) each of the three final MPA proposals as a recommendation to the BRTF. Twenty-two of the twenty-four seats on the NCCRSg completed the survey (one seat was not present, and the other chose not to participate in the survey). Staff clarified that a “yes” response does not require that the NCCRSg member has worked on the proposal; nor does it necessarily mean that the NCCRSg member completely supports all elements of the proposal.

The survey results are as follows:

	Could you “live with” this proposal as a recommendation to the BRTF?	
	Yes	No
Proposal 1-3	15	7
Proposal 2-XA	13	9
Proposal 4	10	12

3. NCCRSg members outlined a gameplan for presenting the results of the March 18-19, 2008 meeting to the BRTF.

Suggestions included:

- Presentation of the NCCRSg MPA proposals should consist of a mix of staff overview and proposal work team presentation of details and rationale.
- Proposal work team leads should take the lead in presenting the proposals, but other work team members should have the opportunity to fold in comments.
- BRTF members should be provided with sufficient time to ask clarifying questions on each proposal. Members of that respective work team should be at the table to participate in this discussion.
- Presentation of the proposals should take place in a side-by-side format. Maps and MPAs should be presented at the same scale and using the same colors.
- Each proposal work team should have the opportunity to present its entire proposal and how it holds together.
- Work teams should coordinate before the next BRTF meeting to plan and structure their presentations to the BRTF.

- NCCRSG members may want to make a statement early on in the BRTF meeting regarding the importance of respecting the internal logic of the individual proposals and describing some of the pitfalls that might be associated with “mixing and matching” between the proposals.

4. Proposal work teams identified team leads.

Proposal work team leads are primarily responsible for coordinating review of the proposal maps and template forms, and for presenting to the BRTF. The identified team leads are as follows:

Proposal 1-3:	Tom Baty, Rick Johnson, Samantha Murray
Proposal 2-XA:	Ben Sleeter, Ed Tavasieff
Proposal 4:	Karen Garrison, Fred Smith

Other work team members will also be invited to participate in presentations to the BRTF.

C. Final NCCRSG meeting: NCCRSG invited to participate in the BRTF’s April 22, 2008 meeting.

NCCRSG members discussed the importance of having all NCCRSG members present when the BRTF discusses the NCCRSG MPA proposals at the BRTF’s April 22-23, 2008 meeting.

The I-Team and BRTF Chair Golding invited the NCCRSG to participate on Day 1 of the BRTF’s April 22-23, 2008 meeting. The meeting will take place in San Rafael, CA. NCCRSG members will assist work team leads in the presentation of the MPA proposals; they will also participate in addressing BRTF questions.

The BRTF meeting on April 22, 2008 will include specific recognition of NCCRSG members for their efforts in the north central coast process. Staff strongly encouraged all NCCRSG members to participate in the April 22, 2008 meeting.

D. Public comment

The March 18-19, 2008 NCCRSG meeting included two designated public comment periods. These were scheduled after lunch on Day 1 and at the beginning of Day 2 so that the public comments would inform the NCCRSG’s ongoing deliberations on the work team proposals. About 25 members of the public provided comments on one or both days. Key comments included:

- Several members of the public commented on the appropriate role of special closures:
 - Several speakers, including representatives of federal resource management agencies, expressed support for including special closures in the MPA proposals.
 - Other speakers stressed that education and outreach may be more important to minimizing disturbance of seabirds and marine mammals than special closures.
 - Several speakers noted that large special closures at the Farallon Islands may pose impediments for ecotourism.
 - One speaker stressed that special closures need to be based on scientifically-based guidelines to help ensure effectiveness.
 - One speaker raised possible safety issues associated with a potential special closure at Fish Rocks.

- Several speakers expressed support for proposal 2-XA as one that best addresses potential socioeconomic impacts and fishing interests, including continued fishing access to the Duxbury Reef area.
- Several speakers suggested that catch-and-release fishing in the Pescadero Creek area be allowed to continue.
- Several speakers suggested that aquaculture be allowed to continue in Drakes Estero.
- Several speakers commented on the importance of commercial and recreational fishing (including abalone diving) for local economies in the northern part of the study region (e.g., Point Arena, Salt Point).
- One speaker advocated protecting key non-consumptive diving areas in SMRs (e.g., cove south of Gerstle Cove, Fort Ross)
- Several speakers advocated allowing continued abalone diving in the Salt Point area due to the good access.

III. Recap of Next Steps

A. Key next steps for NCCRSG members included the following

1. Work team leads to develop proposal narratives and transmit these to the I-Team by evening on March 23, 2008.
2. Work teams to review and suggest revisions to the template forms by evening on March 23, 2008.
3. Work team leads to plan presentations to the BRTF.
4. NCCRSG members participate in April 22, 2008 BRTF meeting.

B. Near-term next steps for I-Team staff (these have been completed)

1. Transmit templates to work teams for review by COB March 20, 2008.
2. Transmit updated maps to work teams by COB March 24, 2008.

C. Upcoming meeting dates

April 3, 2008: SAT meeting to evaluate next iteration of MPA proposals
April 22, 2008: NCCRSG meeting to present NCCRSG MPA proposals to BRTF (in conjunction with April 22-23, 2008 BRTF meeting)
April 22-23, 2008: BRTF meeting to evaluate next iteration of MPA proposals and prepare a recommendation for a preferred alternative to submit to the Fish and Game Commission.